SELECTED CORRELATES OF INTERACTION EFFECTIVENESS AMONG RESIDENCE HALL ASSISTANTS

By

WESLEY HAROLD SKINNER II

Bachelor of Arts in Education
East Central Oklahoma State University
Ada, Oklahoma
1961

Master of Teaching
East Central Oklahoma State University
Ada, Oklahoma
1963

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1975

SELECTED CORRELATES OF INTERACTION EFFECTIVENESS AMONG RESIDENCE HALL ASSISTANTS

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due to those who have given encouragement and assistance in so many ways throughout the course of this study. Special appreciation is due the advisory committee: Dr. Frank McFarland, Chairman; Dr. Robert Brown; Dr. Clayton Morgan; and Dr. Larry Perkins. Gentlemen all, these committee members have provided patient and humane guidance on every occasion. The feelings of trust, respect, and friendship which have developed will be long remembered.

Indebtedness is acknowledged to the Office of Single Student Housing for approving and facilitating the data gathering process. Especially helpful and encouraging, Mr. Kent Sampson, Assistant Director, deserves a special thanks. Appreciation is also extended to the residence hall assistants, their students, the head residents, and assistant head residents who participated.

Finally, words cannot adequately express the depth of appreciation which I feel for the support and understanding given me during the time of this study by my wife, Martha. Our sons, Jay and Tad, were as understanding as could be expected of children their age. Perhaps the gratitude I feel to my family can be adequately demonstrated in the days to come.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

As a contributing factor in the development of college students, the experience of residence hall living can exert a great influence. College age young adults are faced with the need to develop personal competencies directly related to self and others. The residence hall setting offers a rich opportunity for the provision of student personnel services. The potential impact of meaningful service programing is underscored by findings which indicate that resident students spend some sixty to sixty-five percent of their time in the residence hall environment (Greenleaf, 1969).

The recent secondary school graduate who makes the decision to attend a residential college most often finds an environment remarkably different from that of the high school years. In addition to being in a different geographic location, familiar routines are supplanted by new, often complex and demanding schedules. A difficult area of adjustment involves the need to structure additional interpersonal relationships. Social contact now comes through new acquaintances who possess diverse kinds of backgrounds, a decided contrast to one's family members, neighborhood friends, and familiar classmates.

A strong student personnel involvement in college housing can be designed to assist the transitional adjustment process of residents. Furthermore, the experience of group living can and should be utilized

to promote the more basic social and psychological development of students. The opportunity to associate with different kinds of persons can contribute to increased ease and freedom in interpersonal relationships. In these interactions the student observes his impact on others and in turn feels the force of peer norms and behavior standards, and is thereby able to develop a more unified and complete value system (Chickering, 1967).

During the period of young adulthood, the development of several specific interpersonal coping behaviors is expected. These include

> . . . trusting, sharing, fulfilling promises, keeping confidences, responding positively to supervision and criticism, meeting others' needs as well as one's own, and accepting responsibility in joint projects (Blocher, 1966, p. 59).

It is the function of student personnel work in residence halls to facilitate these kinds of student development by providing meaningful opportunities for human interactions.

Those personnel workers who will provide services to students in residence halls need to be carefully selected for potential effectiveness. In many institutions, especially the larger ones, it may be that the only meaningful contact a student is likely to have with the student personnel organization will be through the student assistant assigned to his floor (Murphy and Ortenzi, 1966). Certainly, no student personnel worker is likely to have more opportunity for daily interaction with resident students than will the student assistant.

In the case of the university where this study was conducted, selection of student assistants is ordinarily handled by a committee made up of head residents, students, and other staff members of the Division of Single Student Housing. Selection criteria for student assistants

indicate the intent of the university is that the resident hall environment be one of individual concern for each student. This point of view is evidenced by the following statement from the job description published by the Division of Single Student Housing.

> A Student Assistant is an undergraduate, available in the residence hall to be of assistance to students. The Student Assistant is selected on the basis of a display of sensitivity to and interest in people; objectivity and respect for the worth and dignity of the individual; open mindedness on issues; empathy; and the ability to handle autonomy and make decisions (Appendix A).

An application form and interviews usually constitute the extent of formalized investigation into the characteristics of the applicant. At the time of hiring, little is known about the personality factors possessed by the individual which may lead to successful or unsuccessful interaction with the students who are to be served.

The position of student assistant, as described, is one of considerable responsibility. The establishment of sound interpersonal relationships which facilitate the personal and social development of residents is expected. In the event the assistant does not meet expectations, the delivery of personnel services is weakened. Not only are students penalized, housing administrators find themselves involved in time consuming corrective procedures. The identification and utilization of appropriate indicators of probable effectiveness at the selection phase will allow administrators to concentrate attention on developing student assistant competencies rather than correcting deficiencies (Hoyt and Davidson, 1967).

The means of selecting more effective student personnel assistants is a matter of unresolved concern among housing administrators. A dearth of conclusive research evidence exists with regard to both the

identification of desirable characteristics of student assistants and methods for adequately measuring performance effectiveness (Biggs, 1971). If college housing is to make a maximum contribution as an instrument of student development, procedures need to be determined and implemented which will identify characteristics possessed by those applicants who will become the more effective student assistants.

Statement of the Problem and Purpose

Housing administrators who must hire student assistants lack conclusive research evidence which will identify the potentially more effective applicant. Student assistants are most often employed on the basis of limited information drawn from application forms and personal interviews. The major concern of this study is this problem of lack of information about personal characteristics which are requisite to effective student assistant performance in residence halls.

This investigation will attempt to identify and study some characteristics that are related to student assistant effectiveness. Hopefully, information will result which may be incorporated into the screening process by housing administrators as they seek to employ student assistants who will later perform effectively. If such information can be successfully identified, this aid in selecting student assistants may be beneficial to residence hall students and housing administrators at the university where this study was done.

Significance of This Study

As a result of this study, some important benefits may be gained. The selection process for student assistants at the university studied

will be closely reviewed. If a more valid method for assessment of applicants can be shown, modifications of screening and hiring procedures may be made by housing administrators. Student assistants currently employed will be evaluated for interpersonal interaction effectiveness by their residents, thus norms may be produced against which future student assistant effectiveness may be compared. More accurate and valid means of determining potential for effectiveness among student assistant applicants may result in a stronger, more viable student personnel program in the residence halls of the university studied.

In addition, information may be gained about the relationship between certain personal characteristics which are possessed by "helpers." As a stimulus for further investigation, this information may be valuable not only to housing administrators, but also to others in the helping professions who are charged with the selection of effective staff members.

Hypotheses

Stated in the null, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1: There is no significant relationship between any of the subscores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale (IS).

H2: There is no significant relationship between dogmatism as measured by the Dogmatism Scale (DS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

H3: There is no significant relationship between scholarship

(GPA), number of college hours completed, chronological age, number of months of student assistant employment experience, birth order, or sex and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

H4: There are no significant differences between male and female student assistants on any of the variables of this study (IS score, TSCS scores, DS score, grade point average, college semester hours completed, age, months of student assistant experience, birth order).

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this investigation, the following terms and definitions are employed.

Birth Order: the ordinal position of birth into the family. First-borns and only children are grouped together, with all others identified as later-borns.

Interaction: this term describes the interpersonal relationship experience in which feelings are expressed and perceived. English and English (1958) define interaction as "mutual or reciprocal influence between two or more systems."

Interaction Effectiveness: the mean rating on the Interaction Scale. A high rating suggests a high degree of effectiveness; low rating suggests a low degree of effectiveness.

Interaction Scale (IS): an instrument developed by the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Utah which purports to assess interaction within the counselor-client dyad (Appendix D).

Open-mindedness: indicates the openness of belief systems, the opposite of which is closed-mindedness. Open-mindedness will be represented by

low scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, closed-mindedness by high scores.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (DS): an instrument developed by Rokeach which purports to measure differences in openness and closedness of belief systems. Form E of this scale is used (Appendix C).

Self Concept: English and English (1958) define self concept as "a person's view of himself; the fullest description of himself of which a person is capable at any given time." Self concept is represented by scores derived from the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Student: this term is used to identify the college undergraduate who resides in university operated residence halls and who is not employed as a student assistant. A synonymous term is resident.

Student Assistant: an undergraduate student, usually an upperclassman, who is employed by the Division of Single Student Housing for the purpose of providing supervision, guidance, and support to the residents on his wing or floor. He reports to the head resident of his hall, and assists him in carrying out housing policies. Synonymous terms include student counselor, floor counselor, resident assistant, and personnel assistant.

Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS): a scale which purports to measure perceived self concept. The Clinical and Research Form yields 29 scores (see Appendix B).

Assumptions

This study is based upon the following assumptions. Student assistants vary in job performance and students who rate their student assistants will be able to distinguish between those who are effective

and those who are ineffective through the use of an instrument such as the IS. Personal characteristics such as self concept and open-mindedness can be identified and measured and individual differences determined by rating scales such as the TSCS and the DS. Demographic data will be reported accurately by student assistants.

Limitations

This study is concerned with effectiveness in same-sex relationships. Conclusions regarding indicators of effectiveness or ineffectiveness should not be generalized to settings which involve opposite-sex interactions.

Characteristics of effective student assistants who were included in this study may differ from effective student assistants at other colleges and universities. The applicability of any conclusions drawn should not be generalized beyond the university and population of this study.

Summary

The residence hall environment plays an important part in student development. It is the student assistant who is the first line staff representing the student personnel commitment to serve resident students. It is very important to students and to the success of the housing program that student assistants be hired who are effective in their interpersonal interactions.

The selection of student assistants at the university where this study was conducted is based upon an application form and personal interviews. The lack of information about identifiable characteristics

of effective student assistants and how to select those applicants who will later perform effectively is a basic problem.

This study investigates relationships between a number of selected student assistant characteristics and student assistant effectiveness as assessed by students. Hopefully, the results will provide information to assist housing administrators in selecting those applicants who will later perform effectively.

CHAPTER II

A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review presents information and findings from the literature that appear to contribute to a more complete understanding of factors involved in this study. To provide a measure of organizational structure, the chapter is divided into the following sections: residence halls and student development, the utilization and effectiveness of student assistants, the selection of student assistants, and the selection of variables for study. The major findings of the review are presented in the summary.

Residence Halls and Student Development

In America, the founders of the earliest colonial colleges sought to emulate Oxford and Cambridge Universities by providing what was known as the residential college. Residence halls were central to this concept where faculty and students were housed together. The residential college was designed to provide, for students and faculty, an intellectual and moral lifestyle in common. This plan did not prosper in America as it had in England, and soon disappeared. By the nineteenth century, American dormitories "were little more than places for students to sleep, eat, and study" (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, p. 42).

Throughout the years, a major determinant of the form of college housing in the United States has been the philosophic commitment to higher education which the nation was willing to make. The advancement of the twentieth-century idea that higher education should be available to all who are academically able has helped focus attention upon the necessity of meeting student developmental needs through resident housing (Powell, 1969, p. 4).

Although the traditional philosophy of student housing, to furnish shelter, is still professed by administrators of many colleges and universities, an educational philosophy of housing is being implemented in increasing numbers of institutions. The application of this philosophy is accomplished through residence hall programs which seek to enhance the quality of student life both socially and intellectually (Williams and Reilley, 1972).

This more modern emphasis on personal development as an objective of student housing is seen to parallel and be a part of the movement based upon what is known as the "personnel point of view." The statement advancing this philosophy was first formally presented in 1938 by the Committee on College Personnel of the American Council on Education (Mueller, 1961, p. 56). This humanistic approach to dealing with students incorporates the concept of individual uniqueness of interests and needs. Each individual is regarded as being a functioning whole with physical, intellectual, emotional and social elements which must be considered.

The role college housing plays on student life is significant. The degree to which this influence is positive will depend upon the philosophical viewpoint of the housing administrator. Strang has pointed

out the relative educational value of programs which emphasize social aspects of residence hall living when she said: "These experiences constitute a common 'major' for all students . . . . The environment, itself is an instrument of guidance" (Wrenn, 1951, p. 318).

As we have seen, the earliest residence halls in America were designed to provide an educational atmosphere for student development. During the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries, the prevailing philosophy of student housing was to provide shelter. Modern educational thought embraces a commitment to provide opportunity as well as consideration for the development of each student as a unique individual. Based on these concepts, college housing can serve as "an instrument of guidance" in meeting student developmental needs.

Utilization and Effectiveness of the Student Assistant

An important guidance resource on the campus of most four-year institutions of higher learning is the student counselor. It is reported by Brown and Zunker (1966) that 118 of 170 responding institutions in their random sample was utilizing student-to-student counseling. Over eighty-eight percent of these schools reported utilization of these peer counselors in residence halls. Spontaneous comments on the questionnaire reflected favorable reaction to the general idea and ". . . indicated that the major value to be realized from the use of student counselors was their effectiveness in residence hall supervision . . ." (Brown and Zunker, 1966, p. 46).

That students may be even more effective than trained counselors in certain activities is suggested by Zunker and Brown (1966). They

concluded from their study that student counselors receive greater acceptance and better results than professionals when providing certain counseling services. These services include dealing with academic adjustment problems, college rewards and frustrations, personal-social adjustment problems, and the give and take of dormitory life. In a study of the use of students in college counseling centers, Steenland (1973) reports several diverse assignments with the most frequent being in the crisis center.

Increased responsibilities for counseling are being placed on resident assistants. A recent study points to these expectations by describing

> . . . the resident assistant as someone to whom residents can turn for help. He should be prepared to accept responsibility for the guidance of his group, have an awareness of the problems typical of college students, be able to promote social interactions on his floor, and help each resident achieve an adequate social adjustment (Schroeder, Hill, Gormally and Anthony, 1973, p. 313).

Thus, the use of student assistants as peer counselors on campus is seen as the rule rather than the exception. Student counselors are most often utilized through assignment in residence halls. Students cast in the role of counselor are often more effective with certain types of problem areas than are trained counselors. The student assistant who is employed in the residence hall is being expected to fulfill increasingly important responsibilities as the first line student personnel worker on his floor.

Selection of Student Assistants

It would be extremely helpful to those who must select resident hall staff to have available standardized instruments or procedures

with predictive power to distinguish those applicants who will be effective on the job. However, such is not the case. Biggs (1971) concluded from his search of the literature that available research evidence is not sufficient to establish guidelines for the selection of residence hall assistants. He offers the explanation that there are widely held opinions as to "the appropriate roles, job duties, and attitudes of these student personnel workers" (p. 111).

The results of a study conducted by Murphy (1964) indicated the use of a personal interview for student assistant selection by ninety-two percent of the schools responding. An application form or letter was used by eighty-six percent, seventy-three percent used letters of reference, test scores were used by twenty-two percent, and student assistants were selected at random by seven percent.

In addition to selection based on interview, reference letters, and application forms, a number of standardized personality tests have been used in efforts to predict student assistant effectiveness. A review of research literature indicates success has been slight in most cases. Schroeder and Dowse (1968) concluded in their study that the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) was an inadequate selection instrument. They also discovered that neither the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), or the California Personality Inventory (CPI) was able to discriminate between the better and poorer student assistants.

A study at another university utilizing the EPPS and the SVIB indicated that these instruments appeared to have only minimal predictive significance (Murphy and Ortenzi, 1966). Marion (1973) reports that the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale may be useful, along with other

criteria, in selecting potentially successful student assistants. Other instruments which have been used in research with varied degrees of success include the California F Scale, the Adjective Check List, the Overall Agreement Scale, the Bell Adjustment Inventory, the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator, and the Personal Orientation Inventory (Anthony, 1973).

A caution is urged by Schroeder and Dowse (1968) against generalizing any results from one institution to another. Their study, previously cited, yielded conflicting data from two institutions which were studied.

The lack of success which has generally been experienced should not serve to discourage a search for those characteristics and ways to measure them which may prove to have predictive power. Bolton (1972) gives encouragement when he makes the assertion that

> . . . prediction is the central activity in provision of counseling and educational services. Whenever decisions are made which involve an element of uncertainty, the decisions constitute predictions. Prediction research can help to improve decision making . . . (p. 102).

Selection of Variables for Study

Criterion Variable

Perhaps a leading element contributing to the inconsistency of predictive research just cited is the lack of agreement on criterion variables. Wyrick and Mitchell (1971) call attention to the existence of contradictory evidence that students and head residents can agree on the characteristics which define effective or ineffective student assistants. On one hand, the head resident sees the assistant as part

of an organizational staff which must answer collectively and individually to concerns such as efficiency and orderliness. The student, on the other hand, sees the assistant as performing in an interaction mode.

Clearly, a criterion variable can be constructed from either point of view as the researcher desires. Jensen, Coles, and Nestor (1955) define a criterion

> . . . as a behavior or condition which is or can be described in terms of an ideal and which is a goal. That is, a criterion is the kind of behavior which is considered desirable and toward which one works (p. 58).

The desirable behavior of student assistants at the university where this study was conducted is to assist students through interpersonal interaction (Appendix A). Powell (1969, p. 25) points out that how the student assistant relates to students in everyday interactions will determine how they feel about bringing their problems to him. Good interaction is essential to being an effective helper.

The question arises as to who should determine the level of interaction present in a relationship between two people. There has been a certain distrust of the validity of client assessment of interaction by some researchers who prefer to rely on the opinions of trained judges (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967) (Hansen, et al., 1968) (Shapiro, et al., 1968) (Truax, 1966). However, in a study designed to control for the distortion of perception which might be due to the severity of the client's problem, Caracena and Vicory (1969) found no significant relationship between judges and clients ratings, either among psychotics or "normals." McWhirter (1973) also found no relationship in his study of client vs. judges ratings, and offered a possible explanation "that the clients based their ratings on the total interaction, including both

verbal and nonverbal cues" (p. 320). The basis for the judges ratings was limited to verbal interactions on audiotape (McWhirter, 1973).

Thus, a point of controversy exists. What is seen by one researcher as subjective rater bias is seen by another as accurate perception. The former view is supported if the criterion can be identified as a product of one's efforts which may be set apart, dismantled if need be, and measured by instruments whose values are known to all. Cronbach (1970) speaks in general of rater bias when he observes that the rating of another is often a reflection of the personal relationship rather than the quality of the person's work. The point seems clear that no person can precisely perceive or judge the quality of another person's experience of human interaction.

A strong case for considering the interaction itself as criterion is made by Miller (1972). He compares applying "cost-benefit analysis" criterion standards to the human experience in counseling with going "to a symphony orchestra, expecting that tomorrow you will make more toilet seats on your assembly line" (p. 15). Commenting critically on what he views as a prevailing (and false) emphasis in our culture, he says:

> Interaction is a vehicle for some other purpose, and we always expect its validation in an external criterion. Perhaps the only profession to escape this model is prostitution; but I don't think they are concerned about the criterion problem (Miller, 1972, p. 16).

Self Concept

Increasing attention in recent years has been directed to theorizing and researching the self concept. The stage was set for this scientific inquiry when William James included a chapter on the self in

his 1890 book, Principles of Psychology. His definition was very general; the self being the sum total of all that a person can call his own (Hall and Lindzey, 1957).

The origin and manifestation of the self-concept have been explored at length by such contemporary theorists and practitioners as Rogers, Maslow, and Combs and Snygg. Under their discussion of self theory, Hall and Lindzey identify some twelve major theories on the self, along with others which include formulations on self as part of a theory (1957, pp. 467-502). This proliferation of viewpoints has encouraged numerous approaches in the attempt to measure self concept. Wylie (1961) identified the use of almost 200 such instruments through 1959. For a number of years, this tendency of researchers to develop their own instruments has made the comparison of results difficult. Limited knowledge of reliability, validity, and norms has also been a problem.

It is likely, at this time, that the most prominent figure in the research of the self concept is William Fitts. The following statement embodies Fitts' definition of self concept.

> Self theory is strongly phenomenological in nature and based upon the general principle that man reacts to this phenomenal world in terms of the way he perceives this world. Probably the most salient feature of each person's phenomenal world is his own self--the self as seen, perceived, and experienced by him . . . . The self concept, or self image, is learned by each person through his lifetime of experiences with himself, with other people, and with the realities of the external world (Fitts, et al., 1971, p. 3).

In 1965, Fitts published his Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) (Fitts, 1965). Since that time, research projects numbering in the hundreds have been conducted utilizing the TSCS. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this research is the extent of analysis and synthesis of results which has been applied to the data. In 1967, a grant

was awarded by Social and Rehabilitative Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for study on the self concept and rehabilitation. Under Fitts' leadership, a research staff was assembled which utilized the results and the data from hundreds of independent projects as well as conducting their own original research. As a result of applying a common criterion to many studies with widely diverse subjects, new insights came from the synthesis and integration of these studies. As Fitts (1972c) puts it:

> . . . we began to discover a gestalt effect; the whole was greater than the sum of the parts. The blending and combining of data from many studies revealed nuances and meanings that none showed separately (p. 3).

The results of the Studies on the Self Concept and Rehabilitation project are reported in a series of seven monographs. Of particular interest to this study is the question of whether interpersonal behavior is predictable from self concept. Thompson (1972), cites correlational studies between the TSCS and Schutz's FIRO-B scores and between the TSCS and the Interpersonal Perception Method. The conclusion is reached that these and other studies support the notion "that interpersonal behavior is predictable from the self concept" (Thompson, 1972, p. 79). Fitts adds further explanation by saying

> . . . the self concept is the frame of reference through which the individual interacts with his world. Thus, the self concept is a powerful influence in human behavior (Fitts, et al., 1971, p. 3).

Therefore, the selection of self concept for study as a predictor variable seems to have merit. Student assistants come to the job as unique individuals, ready to interact in the environment of the residence hall. Those elements of the self concept which relate significantly to interpersonal interactions should be known to those who must

select student assistants.

Open-mindedness

Open-mindedness refers to the openness of an individual's belief-disbelief system. At the opposite end of the continuum is closed-mindedness. A person's system is open to

> . . . the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (Rokeach, 1960, p. 57).

Rokeach contends that ". . . it is not so much what you believe that counts, but how you believe" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 6).

The construct representing open-closed-mindedness is dogmatism. According to Rokeach (1960, p. 5), dogmatic is synonymous with closed-mindedness. This construct involves the convergence of three highly interrelated variables. These are closed cognitive system, authoritarianism, and intolerance (Rokeach, 1954). These variables relate directly to three types of acceptances or rejections--of ideas, of authority, and of people (Rokeach, 1960, p. 8).

The dogmatic person may be described as resistant to change, intolerant, prejudiced, and opinionated (Rokeach, 1954). Triandis (1971, p. 123) asserts that the dogmatic is anxious, rigid, a poor problem solver, and intolerant of ambiguity.

There seems little doubt that one who proposes to relate positively in a counseling relationship serving a diverse group of people should have the characteristics of the low-dogmatic (Pietrofesa, 1971, pp. 153-155). In other words, open-mindedness toward ideas, authority, and people is desirable. As related to openness of student assistants,

Powell (1969, p. 41) points out the need to be able to accept change in students, to change one's own mind, and to encourage and benefit from criticism.

Demographic Data

A demographic item of recent interest to many researchers is order of birth into the family. Miley (1969) compiled a bibliography if 119 items on this topic from the Psychological Abstracts of 1963-1967. A recent computerized search of materials listed with the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) revealed seventy additional references.

The notion that birth order may influence the way in which the individual learns to interact with others is not new. Bentine (1958) paraphrased Jung when she wrote:

> the family is . . . like the primordial soup in which the individuals swim around as little fishes, incapable of living apart. The family is taken for granted by the child as the necessary background which is there as a matter of course. It pre-exists the separate members who compose it, and appears to each newcomer simply as the way things are (p. 9).

Anastasi (1958, pp. 63-64) pointed out differences in the psychological environment which siblings experience. She observed that the very presence of the other sibling creates a difference which will bring about varying behaviors within the physical environment.

A finding by Schachter (1959) is somewhat typical of many which show differences between first-borns and later-borns. In his study, first-borns seemed more anxiety-prone and more desirous of associating with others when they were anxious than were later-borns. Yet another study (Oberlander, et al., 1971) suggests that first-borns are more

disposed toward intellectual activities and later-borns toward social activities having a high degree of social participation and concern. These studies and others indicate that birth order may contribute to the prediction of interaction level among residence assistants and students.

It is expected that certain other demographic information may also yield important variables worthy of study. This contention is borne out by studies showing differences in sex and grade point average as partially contributing to prediction of resident assistant effectiveness (Anthony, 1973) (Holbrook, 1972) (Wyrick and Mitchell, 1971). Other variables, while not specifically supported by the literature, are often included for investigation by studies such as the present one. Chosen for further study are age, number of college hours completed, and amount of work experience as a student assistant.

Summary

Residence halls now fulfill a role in student life which is quite different from that of primarily furnishing shelter, as had been the case well into the 20th century. This new role of promoting total student development is an embodiment of the "personnel point of view." The social and intellectual components of the resident are enhanced through a housing program which regards him as a functioning whole and a unique individual whose current needs, interests and drives are important.

The representative of the student personnel office which has most frequent contact with the resident student is the student assistant. Student assistants have been proven effective in the provision of those

guidance and counseling services into which the majority of student needs fall.

At present, suitable standardized guidelines do not exist to aid in the selection of student assistants who are likely to prove most successful. Interviews and reference letters are probably the most universally used means of selection. Various personality measurement instruments have been researched for predictive purposes. For the most part, results have been discouraging and for those which show minimal significance there is little promise of generalization to other institutions.

One of the leading difficulties in prediction studies is the criterion variable and its measurement. There are differences of opinion as to whether the "personnel point of view" should dominate with interpersonal interaction being the prime criterion of effectiveness, or whether the "cost-benefit analysis" model should be applied to student assistant assessment. Based on selection guidelines listed in the job description for student assistants at the university where the study was conducted, selection of the former is indicated.

The self concept is learned through the perception of experiences which one has with his phenomenal world. Self concept as a predictor variable seems a sound choice based on the theoretical point of view that the image of one's self will have a direct effect on how he deals with his environment.

The way in which one holds his beliefs, regardless of what he believes, can be described as being on a continuum from open-mindedness to closed-mindedness. The closed-minded person has been described in terms which counterindicate probable success in interpersonal

interactions.

Numerous studies have been conducted in recent years which indicate that the order of birth into the family does have an influence on later behaviors. Further study of this variable may contribute to increased understanding of individual differences in interaction situations.

Other demographic data may contribute to the prediction of effectiveness of student assistants. Chosen for further study are sex, age, grade point average, college hours completed, and student assistant experience.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The effectiveness of residence hall assistants, serving as first-line student personnel workers, is an important factor in college housing program success. Housing administrators are faced with the task of selecting assistants who are capable of interacting with residents in a manner which facilitates social and educational development. However, a major problem is a lack of information about characteristics which may assist in the identification of potentially effective student assistants.

The purpose of this investigation was to identify characteristics among student assistants which may relate to assessed effectiveness. This chapter identifies the subjects of the study, procedure of data collection, the instruments used, the variables considered, and the statistical treatment of the data.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were residence hall student assistants employed for the 1974 Spring semester at a large, midwestern state university. Student assistants from twelve of the thirteen residence halls were asked to participate. One hall, housing student athletes,

was excluded from the study because the programming emphasis there was radically different from the other halls.

This study included seventy student assistant subjects from the total population of one hundred-one. Two had been recently assigned to their floors and were not included for this reason. Two turned in answer sheets which were unscorable. Another twenty-seven refused to participate in the testing and offered varied reasons, most of which centered upon the themes of threat or disinterest. The testing was viewed as a personal threat with comments such as "Tests like these are an invasion of privacy," or "These tests will be used against student assistants." Others reflected disinterest by offering a simple "I don't want to," or "I'm not going to be an assistant next year so I'm not interested."

Additionally, seven hundred resident students participated in this study, rating their student assistant by responding to the Interaction Scale (IS). These residents were randomly selected from the floor or wing served by each of the seventy student assistants.

Procedure

Testing of Student Assistants

Each student assistant was asked to complete a self report form (Appendix E) and was administered the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Dogmatism Scale (DS). The head resident of each hall administered these instruments at a regularly scheduled hall meeting. An assistant director of single student housing had previously presented the study to the head residents in a staff meeting to familiarize them

with their role and the overall objectives. Testing materials were delivered to each head resident by the researcher and the study was discussed and questions were answered. An outline of information presented in this meeting may be seen in Appendix H. A cover letter of explanation to student assistants is found in Appendix F.

Most participating subjects completed the instruments in approximately thirty minutes. Testing in all halls was completed within a period of two weeks.

Assessment of Effectiveness

Interaction effectiveness, the criterion variable of this study, was based on the rating of student assistants by students using the IS. Ten students from each floor or wing were selected at random to rate their student assistant.

Lists of resident student names from each student assistant unit were supplied by the Division of Single Student Housing. Names on these lists were arranged by room number assignment. Students who had moved onto the unit within the past month were identified and excluded from the lists. The number of students listed ranged from twenty-two to seventy-one.

The randomization process began by preparing one inch square pieces of cardboard, numbered one through seventy-one. These squares were thoroughly mixed and drawn one by one. Since the lists were arranged in similar fashion, only one drawing was held for all lists. The first number drawn was assigned to the name at the top of the list for each floor or wing, the second number drawn was assigned to the next name on each list, and so on until all names on all lists were assigned a number.

Residents who were asked to rate their student assistant were those on each list to whom the ten smallest numbers had been assigned. In this way each resident of each floor had an equal probability of being selected. To replace those students from whom a rating could not be obtained, the next smallest number on the list for that floor was selected.

Residents who were selected received a cover letter requesting their participation in the study (Appendix G), the IS, and a pre-addressed envelope. Distribution and return of materials utilized the campus mail service.

Response to the initial distribution ranged from sixty percent to ninety percent return of scorable instruments. Many returns which were incomplete, either partially or totally, contained varied comments such as "I really don't know my student assistant that well," "My student assistant cares only about him/her self," and "I don't have time to answer questionnaires." Several were returned unopened with such notations as "Doesn't live here anymore," or "Moved to sorority house," or "Dropped out of school."

A follow-up investigation revealed that movement of residents within and between housing units is constantly occurring. Room assignment lists may become outdated quickly, even though a computer system is used. It was noted that only a few of the international students who were selected returned their rating. Also, it seems a small but unspecified percentage of female students chose to continue paying dormitory room rent while residing elsewhere in the community.

On the basis of the follow up, additional students were selected by the procedure explained earlier. Enough were included to insure an

adequate return of ten ratings per student assistant. In those instances where more than ten were subsequently returned, the order of random assignment was adhered to when tabulations were made. All responses were collected within ten days from the first distribution.

When all ratings had been collected and scored, a mean IS rating was calculated for each student assistant. This mean of ten IS ratings was treated as the criterion measure of student assistant interaction effectiveness.

Instruments Used

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) consists of 100 self-description items, ninety of which assess self concept and ten which assess self criticism. The ninety self concept items were derived from a large pool of written self descriptions and items from other self concept measures. Selection was made on the basis of item content as unanimously agreed upon by seven clinical psychologists. The remaining ten items came directly from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory L-Scale and constitute the Self Criticism Score. By means of multiple combinations of items, a total of twenty-nine scales have been defined (Appendix B). Two scoring systems are available, the Counseling Form and the Clinical and Research Form (Fitts, 1965, p. 1). This study utilized the latter.

The TSCS is self administering and requires an average of about thirteen minutes to complete (Fitts, 1965, p. 1). The standardization group was a broad sample which included persons from all parts of the

country, equal numbers of both sexes, blacks and whites, representatives of all social, economic, intellectual and educational levels, and age ranges from twelve to sixty-eight (Fitts, 1965, p. 13). To complete the inventory, the subject responds to self descriptive statements on a one to five scale ranging from completely false to completely true.

The reliability estimate reported in the manual was arrived at by test-retest of sixty college students over a two-week period. These reliability estimates range from .60 for Total Variability to .92 for Total Positive (Fitts, 1965, p. 15). A 1968 study using a Kuder-Richardson split-halves technique reported a reliability coefficient of .91 and a standard error of measurement of 3.30 for Total Positive Scores (Fitts, 1971, p. 62).

At the time the TSCS Manual was published, the principal offer of validity was based upon the manner in which items were selected for inclusion on the scale. In addition to this suggestion of content validity, studies were also reported as evidence of construct validity by showing the scale as capable of differentiating between groups such as psychiatric patients and non-patients; delinquents and non-delinquents; average persons and psychologically integrated persons (Fitts, 1965, p. 17). Subsequent studies are cited by Fitts (1971, pp. 46-53) as evidence of predictive validity, concurrent validity, and construct validity for the TSCS.

The TSCS has been identified by Wylie (1974, p. 230) as one of the more frequently used self-regard instruments. Thompson (1972, p. 2) reported that in the first seven years of publication almost four hundred studies had been completed. It is likely that more research has been done using the TSCS than with any other instrument which purports

to measure self concept.

Dogmatism Scale, Form E

The Dogmatism Scale, Form E, (DS) is an instrument developed by Rokeach to measure the degree of open-mindedness and closed-mindedness in individuals. Though not a published instrument, the DS has been frequently used in research and is often encountered in the literature. The regard with which the DS is generally held is exemplified by Kerlinger's assessment that "Rokeach's work is another serious and ambitious attempt to measure important and complex variables--with, it is believed, considerable success" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 501). Several revisions of the original DS resulted in the development of the present forty item scale (Rokeach, 1960, p. 73).

Reliability is reported for several different populations using the test-retest method. Coefficients range from .68 for a group of university students to .93 for residents of a Veterans Administration facility (Rokeach, 1960, pp. 89-90). Additional reliability studies have been reported using test-retest and split-half techniques which parallel Rokeach's findings (Lake, Miles, and Earle, 1973, p. 18).

Validity was established by the "method of known groups." Two separate studies were conducted using this method. In one, college professors were asked to name students whom they considered most and least dogmatic. In the other study, graduate psychology students were asked to identify high and low dogmatic acquaintances. The results showed those identified as highly dogmatic persons (closed-minded) scored higher on the scale than those identified as low dogmatic. Reported differences were quite significant with a probability of occurring by

chance of only one time in a hundred (Rokeach, 1960, pp. 101-103).

The instrument is self administering with written instructions. The subject is asked to read each statement and respond with his personal opinion on a six item scale. The scale ranges from +3 (I agree very much) to -3 (I disagree very much). A constant of +4 is added to each score to produce a total range on the DS from forty to two hundred eighty. Dogmatism is rated along the continuum from a low score (open-minded) to a high score (closed-minded). High scorers are considered dogmatic and unreceptive to new ideas; low scorers are seen as flexible, adaptive, and receptive to new ideas.

Interaction Scale

The Interaction Scale (IS) was developed by the staff of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Utah in response to a need for assessment of the interaction in the client-counselor dyad. An instrument was needed which could be completed in approximately five minutes and at the same time measure perceptions and feelings concerning the interaction (Jorgensen, 1968, p. 11).

Based on consideration of the theories of Schutz, Foa, and Horney, the research staff selected ten pairs of items from a pool of approximately 200 terms from the "needs" lists of Murray and Edwards. These were grouped and arranged to form the IS. The first revision resulted in two scales, the Expression Scale and the Perception Scale, of twenty items each. Since both members of the dyad may respond to the IS, up to four subscores are possible. They are: a) the Counselor Expression Score, b) the Counselor Perception Score, c) the Client Expression Score, and d) the Client Perception Score (Jorgensen, 1968, pp. 12-13). This

present study utilized the forty items assessing client expression and perception of the interaction.

Test-retest reliability studies on the IS indicate that coefficients on each of the four subscores were significant at the .01 level, ranging from .58 to .83 when tested on the third and fourth interaction encounter. The caution was raised that it appears interactions must have sufficient time to develop (Jorgensen, 1968, p. 16). This was further confirmed by Janzen (1970, p. viii) in his study utilizing the IS.

The nature of the interaction to be assessed in the present study occurs on a more or less continual basis. Reliability studies offered by the authors of the IS were based upon three and four short encounters, with reliability estimates reported which may be considered somewhat low. Therefore, a test-retest of reliability utilizing subjects and conditions of interaction similar to the proposed study was conducted by this researcher to determine a more appropriate estimate of reliability. Twenty-two college students were asked to rate another student identified as a "helper," using the IS. The student and the helper had been in an interaction situation on a daily basis five days a week for over six weeks. After a two week interval, during which the interaction continued, the student again rated the helper. A Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient of .95, significant at the .001 level, was computed (Bruning and Kintz, 1968, p. 187). This estimate, when compared to previous reliability studies of the IS, suggests suitable reliability for the present investigation.

Because of the nature of the development of the IS, where the research staff sat as a panel of judges to select appropriate items from

established instruments, it was assumed to have construct validity. Jorgensen (1968) indicates that research conducted using the IS supports that assumption when he states:

> The IS was designed to measure the dynamic set of variables in dyadic relationships. Because the IS testings followed the pattern of interaction found by other investigators, notably Newcomb (1956), Gordon (1955), and Foa (1958), it is assumed that the IS had logical or construct validity (p. 43).

A copy of the IS may be seen in Appendix D. The member of the dyad responds to two separate twenty item scales. One provides a measure of the expression of feeling he has toward his partner. The other measures his perception of his partner's feelings toward him. Responses are made on the basis of a feeling being expressed or perceived most of the time, more than half the time, less than half the time, or hardly ever. Maximum score responses are alternated in such a way as to break any response pattern.

To score the IS, the maximum score response receives four points, the adjacent response receives three, etc. The assignment of maximum item value is demonstrated in Appendix D. To arrive at a measure of the interaction, the value of the item responses are totaled to yield a single score. Therefore, the range of possible scores on the forty items is from forty to one hundred sixty.

The Variables of This Study

The independent variables of this study included the twenty-nine scores derived from the TSCS (Appendix B), the DS score, and demographic factors including scholarship as represented by grade point average, college hours completed, age in months, months of experience as student assistant, and birth order. Based on a review of the literature, any of

these may be significantly related to interaction effectiveness of student assistants and may, in combination with one another, contribute toward the prediction of successful student assistant performance.

The criterion variable was student assistant interaction effectiveness. The mean IS rating of student assistants by randomly selected students who resided on their floor or wing served as the measure of interaction effectiveness.

Treatment of the Data

The first three hypotheses of this study concerned the relationships between student assistant interaction effectiveness and the scores of the TSCS, dogmatism, grade point average, the number of college semester hours completed, chronological age, length of experience as a student assistant, birth order, and sex. These hypotheses were tested by computing a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient between the criterion measure and each of the independent variables. The statistical significance of each correlation coefficient was determined by consulting the tabled values for r, using the appropriate degrees of freedom (Bruning and Kintz, 1968, pp. 228-229). Correlation coefficients which reached the .05 level of confidence were accepted as statistically significant.

The fourth hypothesis concerned sex differences on each variable of the study. The means of the male student assistants and the female student assistants were computed for each variable. An F test was calculated to determine the homogeneity of variance (Guilford and Fruchter, 1973, p. 168). In those instances where homogeneous variances were found, the t-test for independent groups with unequal N's was computed.

The critical values of the t statistic was determined by referring to the tabled values of t (Bruning and Kintz, 1968, pp. 218-219). Differences between the means which reached the .05 level of confidence were accepted as statistically significant.

Where unequal variances were discovered, t was computed by the Cochran-Cox method (Cochran and Cox, 1957, pp. 100-102). This technique, to control for variance error which may be the result of the inequality of variances, in effect increases the size of the error term which in turn causes a reduction in the value of the obtained t. The t thus computed is more conservative (and true) than would be obtained if variances were assumed to be homogeneous when actually they were unequal. The Cochran-Cox formula for t, when testing the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between means, is:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

Where:

$\bar{X}_1$ = the mean for group one

$\bar{X}_2$ = the mean for group two

S_1 = the variance for group one

S_2 = the variance for group two

N_1 = the number of subjects in group one

N_2 = the number of subjects in group two.

Furthermore, the obtained t must be compared with some critical value.

The formula for computing this value is:

$$t_{\alpha} = \frac{t_{\alpha_1}\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + t_{\alpha_2}\frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}$$

Where:

t_{α_1} = tabled value of t associated with group 1 at .05 level with df = $N_1 - 1$.

t_{α_2} = tabled value of t associated with group 2 at .05 level with df = $N_2 - 1$.

Differences were accepted as statistically significant where t was greater than t_{α}.

A stepwise regression analysis was also performed on both the male and female student assistant groups. The IBM 360, Model 65 computer of the University Computer Center was utilized for this procedure, as well as for the Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients. The program used was the BMD02R Stepwise Regression Analysis, developed by the University of California, Los Angeles. This program computes the correlation coefficients, means, and standard deviations for each variable in the study. In addition, the program computes a sequence of multiple linear regression equations in a stepwise manner (Dixon, 1971, p. 233).

In the stepwise regression method, the independent variable that has the highest correlation with the dependent variable is selected, then regression statistics are calculated. In the next step, the independent variable is selected which, after the first variable, contributes most to the variance of the dependent variable. The computer then

calculates the contribution the first variable would have made if it had been entered second. A test of statistical significance is then calculated. If no significance is found, the variable is dropped from the equation. Additional independent variables are considered one at a time, then calculated, tested, and added to the equation or dropped. This sequence terminates when no more variables will be added and no more rejected (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 543).

The printout obtained from the BMDO2R program included the correlation matrix for the variables of the study. At each step in the calculation of regression statistics, the following were printed: the multiple correlation coefficient (R); the standard error of estimate; the F ratio for entering or removing the variable from the equation; variables in the equation; and variables not in the equation. A summary table showed the proportion of total variation (R^2) accounted for by each included variable at each step. Additionally, the actual and predicted ratings for each subject in the study was printed.

Summary

The principal subjects of this study were seventy student assistants in the residence halls of a large midwestern state university. Other subjects were the seven hundred residents who rated the interaction with their student assistant. The procedure of testing student assistants and assessing interaction effectiveness was identified. The instruments used were the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Dogmatism Scale, and the Interaction Scale. Each instrument was described with supportive research reported. Statistical techniques for treating the

data were given. Chapter IV will present a detailed account of the statistical treatment of the data and an analysis of the results of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study investigated the relationship of selected characteristics, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the Dogmatism Scale, and demographic self report items, with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the Interaction Scale. The resulting data were considered separately as male and female subgroups and as a single group when appropriate. Four hypotheses were tested. In addition, for both the female and male groups, a step-wise multiple regression analysis was performed to identify the optimum subset of variables which were predictive of interaction effectiveness. Stated in the null, the four hypotheses were as follows:

H1: There is no significant relationship between any of the subscores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale (IS).

H2: There is no significant relationship between dogmatism as measured by the Dogmatism Scale (DS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

H3: There is no significant relationship between scholarship (GPA), number of college hours completed, chronological age, number of

months of student assistant employment experience, birth order, or sex and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

H4: There are no significant differences between male and female student assistants on any of the variables of this study (IS score, TSCS scores, DS score, grade point average, college semester hours completed, age, months of student assistant experience, birth order).

The Criterion Variable

Interaction effectiveness of student assistants, assessed by their residents, was the criterion variable. The criterion measure was the mean score of ten randomly selected residents who completed the Interaction Scale (IS) on their student assistant. The possible range of scores was 40 to 160 with the higher score indicating greater effectiveness. In the present study, the range of criterion scores was 122 to 151 for the females, with a mean of 137.51 and a standard deviation of 7.15. The range for the males was 116 to 146 with a mean of 133.04 and a standard deviation of 8.86. The range of ratings by individual raters was from 58 to 160 for females and from 49 to 160 for males.

The rating for each student assistant may be seen in Tables I and II. As these data were being tabulated, the possibility of relationship between the amount of variance among ratings and the mean rating was noted. A Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient between these two measures was computed for both the female and male groups. This correlation coefficient was found to be -.75 for females and -.92 for males, both statistically significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

TABLE I

RATINGS FOR EACH FEMALE STUDENT ASSISTANT ON THE IS

Assistant Number	Mean Rating	Range Low	Range High	Variance	Standard Deviation
1	144.9	125	154	114.49	10.70
2	150.5	138	160	45.16	6.72
3	138.3	104	159	283.59	16.84
4	129.2	89	158	370.56	19.25
5	128.4	57	158	997.93	31.59
6	122.0	96	158	713.42	26.71
7	131.5	102	153	364.05	19.08
8	129.2	89	158	370.56	19.25
9	137.8	102	154	343.73	18.54
10	146.0	131	154	67.40	8.21
11	146.3	129	160	91.97	9.59
12	134.6	104	158	327.61	18.10
13	127.9	111	152	129.50	11.38
14	144.9	125	154	84.46	9.19
15	137.5	103	153	258.57	16.08
16	146.6	137	156	42.51	6.52
17	122.5	103	157	305.20	17.47
18	138.7	120	151	94.87	9.74
19	143.5	108	158	196.28	14.01
20	134.6	117	145	70.90	8.42
21	130.8	68	152	590.49	24.30
22	142.8	119	158	127.92	11.31
23	131.3	97	154	332.70	18.24
24	131.1	69	153	590.98	24.31
25	142.2	107	159	280.23	16.74
26	135.5	101	158	400.80	20.02
27	133.1	98	158	370.56	19.25
28	146.1	131	157	77.62	8.81
29	135.5	113	150	174.24	13.20
30	133.3	118	158	191.27	13.83
31	140.1	90	160	442.26	21.03
32	134.2	105	150	216.09	14.70
33	144.4	133	155	46.24	6.80
34	137.8	102	152	234.70	15.32
35	145.0	127	158	125.66	11.21
36	125.7	58	153	1016.33	31.88
37	133.2	86	157	661.00	25.71
38	131.0	94	160	491.07	22.16
39	142.1	122	158	150.55	12.27
40	137.1	123	151	102.82	10.14
41	137.3	111	152	211.99	14.56
42	139.6	98	149	234.09	15.30
43	148.6	126	160	110.04	10.49

TABLE II

RATINGS FOR EACH MALE STUDENT ASSISTANT ON THE IS

Assistant Number	Mean Rating	Range Low	Range High	Variance	Standard Deviation
1	142.3	131	160	63.04	7.94
2	117.2	49	157	890.43	29.84
3	113.0	100	158	471.32	21.71
4	137.0	111	154	200.79	14.17
5	140.9	120	160	219.34	14.81
6	146.3	134	153	31.81	5.64
7	133.6	95	152	317.20	17.81
8	138.0	129	153	50.27	7.09
9	120.6	55	157	1004.89	31.70
10	136.2	96	157	330.51	18.18
11	144.4	135	150	25.81	5.08
12	134.8	125	142	39.94	6.32
13	118.4	61	155	1098.92	33.15
14	132.9	98	150	229.83	15.16
15	132.2	101	157	266.02	16.31
16	141.3	130	158	75.52	8.69
17	120.3	100	151	1054.30	32.47
18	134.9	108	153	154.01	12.41
19	132.7	103	153	309.76	17.60
20	125.2	78	159	798.63	28.26
21	141.2	134	155	43.82	6.62
22	136.6	124	152	111.09	10.54
23	146.3	129	160	106.92	10.34
24	132.1	101	159	415.34	20.38
25	124.4	67	154	579.36	24.07
26	115.6	65	145	709.69	26.64
27	135.0	103	157	301.72	17.37

At least two possibilities exist which may have contributed to this inverse relationship. The first has to do with the rating instrument. The midpoint of the possible range on the IS was 100. All criterion scores for student assistants in both the male and female groups fell above this score. No resident rated an assistant as low as the minimum possible score while several rated at the maximum score. This may have served to restrict the range of actual ratings for the more highly rated assistants, thereby reducing the amount of variance possible. Another possible explanation is that the student assistant who tended to earn a higher mean rating was in fact interacting more effectively and consistently with residents while the assistant who was given a lower mean rating managed a few excellent ratings from a clique or favored group. Therefore, the rating for the more highly rated assistant would reflect less variance than for that of the assistant rated lower. Further investigation beyond the scope of the present study will be required to resolve this question.

Student Assistant Interaction Effectiveness and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The first hypothesis required an investigation of the relationship between student assistant interaction effectiveness and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. It was stated as follows:

H1: There is no significant relationship between any of the subscores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale (IS).

This hypothesis was tested by computing a Pearson's product-moment

correlation coefficient between the criterion measure of interaction effectiveness (IS) and each of the 29 scales of the TSCS. Statistical significance was determined by comparing the resulting correlation coefficients with the tabled values for significance of r, using the appropriate degrees of freedom (Bruning and Kintz, pp. 228-229). The results are presented in Table III.

A total of four scales of the TSCS were found to have a significant relationship (.05 level of confidence) with interaction effectiveness. This finding of significance was on the total number of student assistants in this study. No significance was found when considering either the female or male groups separately.

Total Positive (TP), with an r value of .246, suggests that student assistants who score high on this measure of self concept tend to be rated high on interaction effectiveness. The value of r^2 was .0605, representing approximately six percent of the explained variance. The Total Positive score is the most important single score on the TSCS as it reflects the overall level of self esteem. High scores indicate a liking of self, feelings of personal value and worth, and a high degree of self confidence.

The Column D Positive (CDP) score, assessing family self, had an r value of .318. The value of r^2 was .1011, representing approximately ten percent of the explained variance. This score is reflective of the feelings one has regarding adequacy, worth, and value as a family member and among the closest circle of associates. Student assistants who scored high on CDP were more likely to be rated favorably on interaction effectiveness by residents on their floor or wing.

Defensive Positive (DP) score, a subtle measure of defensive

TABLE III

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF INTERACTION EFFECTIVENESS WITH THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

TSCS Scales**	Total Group N=70	Female Group N=43	Male Group N=27
T/F	.035	-.117	.117
SC	-.176	-.110	-.218
NC	-.026	-.116	.243
TC	-.126	-.126	.015
TP	.246*	.172	.230
R1P	.202	.206	.107
R2P	.226	.120	.213
R3P	.222	.138	.280
CAP	-.011	-.024	.212
CBP	.222	.120	.166
CCP	.202	.127	.226
CDP	.318*	.223	.204
CEP	.235	.213	.192
TV	-.109	-.016	-.181
CTV	-.101	-.023	-.102
RTV	-.078	.000	-.234
DD	.172	.107	.245
D5	.121	.074	.223
D4	-.113	-.148	-.117
D3	-.151	-.044	-.272
D2	-.106	-.072	-.108
D1	.193	.163	.182
DP	.252*	.167	.302
GM	.225	.199	.196
PSY	.110	-.061	-.048
PD	.288*	.145	.256
N	.112	.062	.216
PI	.073	.035	-.003
NDS	-.039	-.179	.197

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**TSCS scales are named and identified in Appendix B.

distortion in self description, was found to have an r value of .252. The value of r^2 was .0635, representing approximately six percent of the explained variance. This score is a measure of one's psychological defenses. Scores near, or slightly above, the mean are usually made by well-integrated people. The subjects of this study had a mean DP score of 59.68 as compared to the TSCS norm group mean of 54.40. Again, high DP scores related positively to high interaction ratings.

An r value of .288 was found for the Personality Disorder (PD) score. The value of r^2 was .0829, representing approximately eight percent of the explained variance. This is an inverse scale where high scores mean low degree of disorder. This finding suggests that student assistants who are rated high on interaction effectiveness have self-perceptions which are dissimilar to persons who have been diagnosed as having one of several types of personality disorder.

Therefore, the first hypothesis as stated must be rejected because of the significant correlation of TP (r=.246), CDP (r-.318), DP (r=.252), and PD (r=.288) with the criterion measure. However, with all of the other TSCS scores, the null hypothesis must be accepted.

Student Assistant Interaction Effectiveness and Dogmatism

The second hypothesis required an investigation of the relationship between student assistant interaction effectiveness and Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale. It was stated as follows:

H2: There is no significant relationship between dogmatism as measured by the Dogmatism Scale (DS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction

Scale.

This hypothesis was tested by computing a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient between the criterion measure of interaction effectiveness (IS) and the DS scores. Statistical significance was determined by comparing the resulting correlation coefficient with the tabled values for significance of r, using the appropriate degrees of freedom (Bruning and Kintz, pp. 228-229). The total student assistant DS scores yielded an r value of -.143, the females an r value of -.099 and the males an r value of -.104. Although the direction of the relationship was as expected (low dogmatic-high interaction), these values were found to be nonsignificant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the null hypothesis must be accepted. There is no evidence from this tested hypothesis to support the position that low dogmatic persons, as measured by the DS, are more effective in interpersonal interactions.

Student Assistant Interaction Effectiveness and Scholarship, College Hours Completed, Age, Experience, Birth Order, and Sex

The third hypothesis required an investigation of the relationship between student assistant interaction effectiveness and certain demographic data. It was stated as follows:

H3: There is no significant relationship between scholarship (GPA), number of college hours completed, chronological age, number of months of student assistant employment experience, birth order, or sex and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

This hypothesis was tested by computing a Pearson's product-moment correlation between the criterion measure of interaction effectiveness and the cumulative grade point average, number of college hours completed, chronological age in months, number of months of student assistant employment experience, order of birth into the family, and sex of each student assistant. Statistical significance was determined by comparing the resulting correlation coefficients with the tabled values for significance of r, using the appropriate degrees of freedom (Bruning and Kintz, pp. 228-229). The results are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF INTERACTION EFFECTIVENESS WITH DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Variable	Total Group N=70	Female Group N=43	Male Group N=27
Scholarship	.175	.211	.189
Hours Completed	.240	.226	.253
Age in Months	.062*	.237	-.069
Experience	.313*	.288	.318
Birth Order	.068*	-.036	-.165
Sex	.290*	--	--

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The results indicated a significant correlation between months of experience and interaction effectiveness (r=.313) for the total group of student assistants studied. This significant relationship suggests

that more experienced student assistants are rated as more effective in interpersonal relationships by their residents. An additional significant correlation occurred between sex and interaction effectiveness (r=.290), also found with the total group. This finding suggests female student assistants tend to be rated higher on interaction effectiveness by their residents than do male student assistants by their residents.

Nonsignificant correlations were found between interaction effectiveness and scholarship, semester hours completed, age, and birth order. Therefore, with the exception of student assistant experience and sex (for which the stated null hypothesis must be rejected), the findings otherwise show that the hypothesis was accepted.

Student Assistant Differences Based on Sex

The fourth hypothesis required an investigation of the differences between scores on each of the variables for the male and female groups. It was stated as follows:

H4: There are no significant differences between male and female student assistants on any of the variables of this study (IS score, TSCS scores, DS score, grade point average, college semester hours completed, age, months of student assistant experience, birth order).

This hypothesis was tested by computing the "Student's" t statistic on each variable of the study to determine the significance of differences in the mean scores of the male and female student assistant groups. As a preliminary step to the computation of t, an F test was performed to determine the equality of variances between these two groups. Variances were found to be homogeneous for all except the DD

and D5 scores of the TSCS. The Cochran-Cox method was applied to the computation of t for these two sets of means. The results of the investigation of mean differences are presented in Table V.

There were four variables which showed a significant difference between means for the male and female groups. It is likely that these findings reflect true differences since the five percent level of confidence for thirty-six variables would allow for less than two instances of difference due to chance alone. Significance was determined by comparing the computed t with the tabled critical values of t, using the appropriate degrees of freedom (Bruning and Kintz, pp. 218-219).

The female group ($\bar{X}$=137.51) was rated significantly higher on the IS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=133.04). This difference was 4.47 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The male group ($\bar{X}$=72.67) scored significantly higher on the CAP-physical self scale of the TSCS than the female group ($\bar{X}$=68.79). This score difference was 3.88 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The female group ($\bar{X}$=74.88) scored significantly higher on the CDP-family self scale of the TSCS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=70.37). This score difference was 4.51 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The female group ($\bar{X}$=79.02) scored significantly higher on the PD-personality disorder scale of the TSCS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=74.37). The score difference on this inverse scale was 4.65 and was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Therefore, the null hypothesis as stated (there are no significant differences between male and female student assistants on any of the variables of this study) must be rejected because of the findings

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENT ASSISTANT GROUPS ON EACH OF THE VARIABLES

		Male Mean N=27	Female Mean N=43	t Values	Probability
1	IS Score	133.04	137.51	2.33	<.05
2	Grade Point Average	3.20	3.19	.10	ns
3	Coll. Hrs. Completed	86.96	86.35	.09	ns
4	Age (in months)	253.89	250.42	1.27	ns
5	Mo. of S A Experience	10.07	10.95	.64	ns
6	Birth Order	1.70	1.72	.18	ns
7	Dogmatism Scale Score	135.48	125.74	1.51	ns
	TSCS Scores*				
8	T/F	1.08	1.08	.00	ns
9	SC	35.00	34.07	.72	ns
10	NC	-0.81	-3.77	1.09	ns
11	TC	26.96	24.98	1.29	ns
12	TP	355.56	360.00	.61	ns
13	R1P	129.52	131.56	.94	ns
14	R2P	109.07	111.40	.68	ns
15	R3P	116.96	117.05	.03	ns
16	CAP	72.67	68.79	2.27	<.05
17	CBP	70.67	73.26	1.41	ns
18	CCP	69.44	70.12	.43	ns
19	CDP	70.37	74.88	2.28	<.05
20	CEP	72.41	72.95	.29	ns
21	TV	42.11	42.63	.19	ns
22	CTV	26.89	26.14	.40	ns
23	RTV	15.22	16.49	.95	ns
24	DD	118.56	116.77	.27	ns
25	D5	16.78	14.81	.73	ns
26	D4	27.81	28.91	.54	ns
27	D3	16.37	17.21	.40	ns
28	D2	20.89	19.91	.55	ns
29	D1	18.15	19.16	.45	ns
30	DP	58.93	59.79	.34	ns
31	GM	99.78	100.79	.51	ns
32	PSY	48.70	46.81	1.40	ns
33	PD	74.37	79.02	2.02	<.05
34	N	88.67	86.88	.88	ns
35	PI	11.41	12.74	1.39	ns
36	NDS	8.41	6.44	.96	ns

Degrees of freedom = 68.

*TSCS scales are named and identified in Appendix B.

related to the IS, physical self, family self, and personality disorder. However, for all of the remaining variables, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Stepwise Regression Analysis

The services of the University Computer Center were utilized to perform a stepwise regression analysis on data from both the male and female student assistant groups. The program chosen was the BMD02R Stepwise Regression, Revised February 26, 1970, Health Sciences Computing Facility, U.C.L.A. This series has been considered one of the best among computer programs for regression analysis (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 654).

This program computed the multiple linear regression equation in a stepwise manner. The first step selected that predictor variable which was most highly correlated to the criterion variable. As additional variables were considered, an analysis of variance was computed at each step to test the significance of that variable for improving the efficiency of the equation. The level of significance for inclusion to or removal from the equation was .05.

The formula for regression is:

$$Y_1 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + \ldots b_nX_n$$

Where:

Y_1 = the predicted score on the dependent variable

a = the constant

$b_1 \ldots . b_n$ = the regression coefficients for each predictor variable, number one through n

$X_1 \ldots . X_n$ = the score on each predictor variable, number one through n.

On the initial computer run, the program performed 36 steps for the female group and 33 steps for the male group. Because of decreasing significance in contribution when considered with other variables, a variable was removed at steps 20, 25, 31, and 32 for the females and at steps 17, 22, 24, and 32 for the males. A visual inspection of the summary tables indicated a noticeable reduction in the amount of increase of R^2 after 10 steps for both groups. The computer was asked to stop with step 10, thereby reducing the variables in the equation from 28 for the females and 25 for the males. Additionally, the variable related to months of experience as a student assistant was removed from consideration as a predictor because new applicants would be inexperienced and therefore could not be measured on this variable.

The intercorrelations of predictor variables in the regression equations for male and female student assistants may be seen in Tables VI and VII. An inspection of these tables will reveal the presence of a low magnitude correlation coefficient between a few variables and interaction effectiveness. These variables are known as suppressor variables. A suppressor variable has been defined ". . . as one wholly uncorrelated with a criterion, but which, by virtue of a correlation with a predictor, improves the prediction of the criterion" (Conger and Jackson, 1972, p. 581). It is the nature of multiple regression that combinations of variables are selected which result in the greatest multiple correlation with the criterion variable. In most instances, the best predictor variables tend to correlate highly with the criterion variable, and correlate at low levels with other predictors. While the

TABLE VI

INTERCORRELATIONS OF VARIABLES IN THE REGRESSION EQUATION FOR MALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS
N=27

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	(IS)	1.000	.280	.197	-.234	.253	-.069	.182	-.181	-.272	.189	.107
2	(R3P)		1.000	-.124	-.150	.085	.336	.819*	-.289	-.874*	.362	.801*
3	(NDS)			1.000	.430*	-.282	-.235	.187	.232	.172	-.172	-.293
4	(RTV)				1.000	-.248	-.086	.145	.789*	.082	-.033	-.331
5	(hrs)					1.000	.600*	-.024	-.237	-.263	.279	.092
6	(age)						1.000	.089	-.084	-.446*	.386*	.275
7	(D1)							1.000	-.056	-.764*	.180	.719*
8	(TV)								1.000	.173	-.073	-.258
9	(D3)									1.000	-.274	-.764*
10	(GPA)										1.000	.345
11	(R1P)											1.000

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE VII

INTERCORRELATIONS OF VARIABLES IN THE REGRESSION EQUATION FOR FEMALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS
N=43

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	(IS)	1.000	.237	.206	.035	-.148	.199	.062	.211	.167	-.099	-.179
2	(age)		1.000	-.446*	-.097	.297	-.353*	-.466*	.163	-.291	.032	.303
3	(R1P)			1.000	-.242	-.465*	.869*	.802*	-.073	.671*	-.021	-.426*
4	(PI)				1.000	.601*	-.071	-.001	.188	-.265	-.192	-.447*
5	(D4)					1.000	-.457*	-.310*	.092	-.455*	-.123	-.018
6	(GM)						1.000	.762*	.055	.596*	-.117	-.587*
7	(N)							1.000	.025	.729*	-.159	-.396*
8	(GPA)								1.000	-.176	-.108	-.109
9	(DP)									1.000	.208	-.012
10	(DS)										1.000	.175
11	(NDS)											1.000

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

presence of suppressor variables is not a common occurrence, when included they appreciably increase the predictive validity of the regression equation by cancelling some irrelevant contribution of another variable (Anastasi, 1968, pp. 147-148).

The best predictors for male student assistant interaction effectiveness were R3P (behavior self concept), NDS (number of deviant signs), RTV (variability of self esteem for basic identity, self satisfaction, and behavior), college hours completed, age, D1 (very definite responses about self), TV (total variability of feelings about self), D3 (undifferentiated manner of responding about self), grade point average, and R1P (basic identity). These ten variables yielded an R of .80 and accounted for sixty-five percent of the common variance. Table VIII presents the results of the stepwise regression procedure. The equation for male student assistants is:

Student Assistant Interaction Effectiveness = 250.84 -.48 (R3P) + .56 (NDS) + .45 (RTV) - 1.33 (hours completed) - .47 (age) - .35 (D1) + .50 (TV) + 4.61 (D3) + .15 (grade point average) - .54 (R1P).

Table IX presents the comparison of actual IS scores with the scores predicted by the regression equation for male student assistants. Results indicated eighty-one percent of the predicted scores fell within one standard error of the estimate of the actual scores and one hundred percent fell within two standard errors of the estimate. This dispersion roughly approximates a normal distribution.

The best predictors for female student assistant interaction effectiveness were age, R1P (basic identity), PI (personality integration), D4 (responses about self not very certain), GM (general maladjustment), N (neurosis), grade point average, DP (defensive positive responses), dogmatism, and NDS (number of deviant signs). These ten

TABLE VIII

STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
FOR MALE STUDENT
ASSISTANTS
N=27

Step	Entering Variable	F Ratio	Standard Error of Estimate	R	R^2
1	R3P	2.12	8.67	.2797	.0782
2	NDS	1.84	8.59	.3645	.1329
3	RTV	2.37	8.23	.4861	.2363
4	Hours	2.42	8.03	.5525	.3053
5	Age	3.02*	7.52	.6466	.4181
6	D1	3.51**	7.05	.7160	.5127
7	TV	3.66**	6.76	.7577	.5741
8	D3	3.32**	6.77	.7718	.5958
9	GPA	2.99*	6.82	.7829	.6129
10	R1P	2.94*	6.70	.8049	.6478

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .025 level of confidence.

TABLE IX

ACTUAL AND PREDICTED IS SCORES FOR
MALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Assistant Number	Actual IS Scores	Predicted IS Scores	Deviation
1	142	139.53	2.47
2	117	116.23	0.77
3	133	127.48	5.52
4	137	137.13	-0.13
5	141	146.40	-5.40
6	146	137.75	8.25
7	134	130.06	3.94
8	138	135.34	2.66
9	121	123.02	-2.02
10	136	140.50	-4.50
11	144	141.98	2.02
12	135	131.91	3.09
13	118	122.38	-4.38
14	133	134.15	-1.15
15	132	128.00	4.00
16	141	134.23	6.77
17	120	129.78	-9.78
18	135	128.92	6.08
19	133	137.60	-4.60
20	125	134.79	-9.79
21	141	142.37	-1.37
22	137	136.70	0.30
23	146	143.00	3.00
24	132	128.79	3.21
25	124	129.98	-5.98
26	116	125.57	-9.57
27	135	128.42	6.58

variables yielded an R of .69 and accounted for forty-eight percent of the common variance. Table X presents the results of the stepwise regression procedure. The equation for female student assistants is:

Student Assistant Interaction Effectiveness = 46.74
+ .86 (age) - .42 (RlP) + .47 (PI) - .73 (D4) -
.68 (GM) + .80 (N) - .34 (GPA) - .10 (DP) +
4.61 (Dogmatism) + .33 (NDS).

Table XI presents the comparison of actual IS scores with the scores predicted by the regression equation for female student assistants. Results indicated seventy-nine percent of the predicted scores fell within one standard error of the estimate of the actual scores, ninety-five percent fell within two standard errors of the estimate, and one hundred percent fell within three standard errors of the estimate. This dispersion approximates a normal distribution.

Summary

This chapter considered the manner of responses of residents as they rated their student assistants for interaction effectiveness. The results of testing the four hypotheses were given. The findings showed hypothesis one was rejected as stated because of significant correlations of TSCS scales TP (r=.246), CDP (r=.318), DP (r=.252), and PD (r=.288) with the criterion measure. Hypothesis two was accepted as stated. Hypothesis three was rejected as stated because of significant correlations of months of student assistant experience (r=.313) and sex (r=.290) with the criterion variable. Hypothesis four was rejected as stated because significant differences were found between male and female student assistants on variables IS, CAP, CDP, and PD. Regression equations were also given for both male and female student

TABLE X

STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
FOR FEMALE STUDENT
ASSISTANTS
N=43

Step	Entering Variable	F Ratio	Standard Error of Estimate	R	R^2
1	Age	2.43	7.03	.2366	.0560
2	R1P	4.31**	6.64	.4211	.1773
3	PI	3.44*	6.59	.4575	.2093
4	D4	3.72**	6.37	.5303	.2812
5	GM	3.41**	6.30	.5616	.3154
6	N	3.06**	6.28	.5814	.3381
7	GPA	2.83*	6.26	.6011	.3613
8	DP	2.68**	6.22	.6214	.3862
9	Dogmatism	2.87**	6.03	.6628	.4394
10	NDS	2.93**	5.91	.6916	.4783

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

**Significant at the .025 level of confidence.

TABLE XI

ACTUAL AND PREDICTED IS SCORES FOR
FEMALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Assistant Number	Actual IS Scores	Predicted IS Scores	Deviation
1	145	143.56	1.44
2	151	145.76	5.24
3	138	140.21	-2.21
4	129	131.87	-2.87
5	128	136.68	-8.68
6	122	125.57	-3.57
7	132	133.85	-1.85
8	145	141.38	3.62
9	139	134.61	4.39
10	146	146.34	-0.34
11	146	137.71	8.29
12	135	133.80	1.20
13	128	132.09	-4.09
14	145	146.36	-1.36
15	138	137.27	0.73
16	147	142.31	4.69
17	123	138.29	-15.29
18	139	143.75	-4.75
19	144	142.75	1.25
20	135	134.90	0.10
21	131	135.48	-4.48
22	143	136.33	6.67
23	131	129.92	1.08
24	131	136.63	-5.63
25	142	141.99	0.01
26	136	134.81	1.19
27	133	140.06	-7.06
28	146	133.42	12.58
29	136	138.95	-2.95
30	133	128.72	4.28
31	140	134.50	5.50
32	134	132.69	1.31
33	144	142.97	1.03
34	138	135.92	2.08
35	145	137.60	7.40
36	126	133.29	-7.29
37	133	133.29	-0.29
38	131	131.74	-0.74
39	142	140.72	1.28
40	137	138.44	-1.44
41	137	142.17	-5.17
42	140	143.20	-3.20
43	149	141.11	7.89

assistants. Conclusions drawn from these findings are presented in Chapter V along with recommendations and summary of the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview of the Investigation

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of selected personal characteristics to student assistant interaction effectiveness. The subjects were seventy residence hall student assistants employed by a large midwestern state university. Each student assistant completed the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (DS), and a demographic self report form. Ten students from each floor or wing were randomly selected to rate their student assistant, using the Interaction Scale (IS). The mean IS score on each student assistant served as the criterion variable of interaction effectiveness.

Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients were computed between the criterion variable and each of thirty-six independent variables in the study. In addition, a t-test was computed to determine whether significant differences occurred between male and female groups on each of the variables. Finally, a stepwise regression analysis was performed to yield a multiple linear regression equation which identified the optimum subsets of variables for predicting interaction effectiveness for both male and female student assistant groups.

Summary of the Results

In this study, four hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis one was stated as follows:

H1: There is no significant relationship between any of the subscores of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale (IS).

The correlation coefficients for this hypothesis may be seen in Table III, page 46. The null hypothesis was rejected for four of the twenty-nine scales of the TSCS. Because the .05 level of confidence was employed, the occurrence of significant relationships due to chance might be expected five percent of the time or less (Runyon and Haber, 1971, p. 167). With the testing of this hypothesis, significant relationships occurred at a rate of over two and one-half times greater than by chance alone, an indication that these are most likely true relationships.

Student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS was found to correlate significantly (r=.246) with the TSCS Total Positive (TP) score. This correlation was not unexpected. The TP is regarded by the TSCS author as that instrument's most important single score (Fitts, 1965, p. 2). This scale reflects one's overall level of self esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly. The student assistant whose own "house is in order" may, in a sense, be more free to demonstrate sensitivity, concern, and commitment to assisting others. There is indication that student

assistants who score high on the TP scale of the TSCS tend to be rated as more effective in their interactions than those assistants who score low on the TP scale.

Student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS was found to correlate significantly (r=.318) with the TSCS Column D Positive (CDP) score. The CDP assesses perceptions of self in relation to the primary group of family and close friends. It is a measure of how much the self is liked, respected, and valued by others. The student assistants who score high on the CDP scale of the TSCS tend to be rated as more effective in their interactions than those students who score low on the CDP scale.

A third significant correlate of interaction effectiveness was the TSCS Defensive Positive (DP) score (r=.252). The DP score is a subtle measure of defensive distortion in self description. While extremely high (72 or higher) scores are indicative of psychiatric patients, well integrated people usually score near, or slightly above the mean on this measure of psychological defense. The subjects of this study had a mean DP score of 59.68. The mean of the norm group was 54.40 and the mean of a group characterized as high in personality integration (above average in mental health) was 58.70 (Fitts, 1965, pp. 17-19). The student assistants who score high on the DP scale of the TSCS tend to be rated as more effective in their interactions than those students who score low on the DP scale.

The fourth and final TSCS scale found to correlate significantly (r=.288) with interaction effectiveness was the Personality Disorder (PD) score. The positive correlation was expected since the PD scale is an inverse scale which means high scores are indicative of low degree

of personality disorder and vice versa. Student assistants who score high on the PD scale of the TSCS tend to be rated as more effective in their interactions than those students who score low on the PD scale.

Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected as stated because of the significant correlations between interaction effectiveness and TP (r=.246), CDP (r=.318), DP (r=.252), and PD (r=.288). Significant relationships were not found to exist between interaction effectiveness and any other TSCS scores.

The second hypothesis was stated as follows:

H2: There is no significant relationship between dogmatism as measured by the Dogmatism Scale (DS) and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

This hypothesis was tested by computing Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients between the IS scores and the DS scores for the total student assistant group, as well as for the female and male subgroups. The resulting correlations (total group r=.143, females r=-.099, males r=.104) were not of significant magnitude to reject the null hypothesis. Although not significant, these correlations are negative, an expectation supported by the literature. The second hypothesis was accepted as stated because of the low order of the coefficients found.

The third hypothesis was stated as follows:

H3: There is no significant relationship between scholarship (GPA), number of college hours completed, chronological age, number of months of student assistant employment experience, birth order, or sex and the level of interaction effectiveness of student assistants as measured by the Interaction Scale.

The correlation coefficients for this hypothesis may be seen in Table IV, page 49. The null hypothesis was rejected for two of the six variables considered. However, it was accepted for the remaining four variables.

The number of months of student assistant work experience was found to correlate significantly (r=.313) with student assistant interaction effectiveness. This finding could be interpreted in at least three ways. In the first place, it may suggest that expertise in interaction effectiveness is gained through experience. The range of experience among the subjects was from two months to twenty-seven months, with the mean length of service being 10.64 months and a standard deviation of 5.59 months. These data and statistics were almost identical for both the male and female groups. A second interpretation may suggest that student assistants who attain greater interaction effectiveness are retained while those who are less effective either voluntarily terminate, are dismissed, or choose not to reapply for another term. A third interpretation, and one which seems more plausible, is that a combination of the previously mentioned interpretations may influence this correlation. Regardless, it appears that the more experienced the student assistants, the more effective their interactions with residents.

Being a female student assistant was found to correlate significantly (r=.290) with interaction effectiveness. Why female residents might tend to rate their student assistant higher than would the males is not clear. One might speculate that males and females may tend to respond differently to the meanings of words in the criterion instrument of this study. As an example, the acceptability of certain words such

as support, protect, calm, or upset, may vary slightly for some persons due to attitudes about what are properly masculine or feminine behaviors. There is however, indication that female student assistants tend to be rated as more effective in their interactions than male student assistants.

Correlations between interaction effectiveness and scholarship, semester hours completed, age, and birth order were found to be non-significant. Therefore, this null hypothesis was rejected as stated for the variables student assistant employment experience and sex.

The fourth hypothesis was stated as follows:

H4: There are no significant differences between male and female student assistants on any of the variables of this study (IS score, TSCS scores, DS score, grade point average, college semester hours completed, age, months of student assistant experience, birth order).

The results of this hypothesis may be seen in Table V, page 52. The null hypothesis was rejected for four of the thirty-six variables. Expected differences due to chance alone would occur less than two times out of thirty-six when employing the five percent level of confidence.

Significant differences were found for the following variables: IS-interaction effectiveness, CAP-physical self, CDP-family self, and PD-personality disorder. The female group ($\bar{X}$=137.51) was significantly higher on the IS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=133.04). This difference was noted in the preceding discussion of the results of testing the third hypothesis and supports that finding. The male group ($\bar{X}$=72.67) was significantly higher on the CAP-physical self scale of the TSCS than the female group ($\bar{X}$=68.79). This difference indicates greater self esteem among males with regard to body image, state of physical health,

physical attributes, and sexuality. The female group ($\bar{X}$=74.88) was significantly higher on the CDP-family self scale of the TSCS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=70.37). This difference indicates greater self esteem among females with regard to relationships with the primary group of family and close friends. The female group ($\bar{X}$=79.02) was significantly higher on PD-personality disorder scale of the TSCS than the male group ($\bar{X}$=74.37). This difference indicates a lower degree of disorder among females than males. The males scored at approximately the fifty-fourth percentile and the females at the forty-third percentile, both well within the normal range. For each of the remaining variables of this study, differences between the male and female student assistant groups did not reach the .05 level of confidence.

The stepwise regression analysis produced a ten variable equation for predicting student assistant interaction effectiveness for both male and female student assistants. The best ten predictor variables for male student assistant interaction effectiveness were found to be R3P (behavior self concept), NDS (number of deviant signs), RTV (variability of self esteem for basic identity, self satisfaction, and behavior), college hours completed, age, D1 (very definite responses about self), TV (total variability of feelings about self), D3 (undifferentiated manner of responding about self), grade point average, and R1P (basic identity). These ten predictor variables yielded an R of .80 and accounted for approximately sixty-five percent of the common variance. The results of the regression procedure at each step are presented in Table VIII, page 58.

The best ten predictor variables for female student assistant interaction effectiveness were found to be age, R1P (basic identity),

PI (personality integration), D4 (responses about self not very certain), GM (general maladjustment), N (neurosis), grade point average, DP (defensive positive responses), dogmatism and NDS (number of deviant signs). These ten predictor variables yielded an R of .69 and accounted for approximately forty-eight percent of the common variance. The results of the regression procedure at each step are presented in Table X, page 61.

Conclusions

The results of statistical tests applied to the data collected in this study lead to the following conclusions:

1. The TP (total positive) scale of the TSCS is positively correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. The student assistant who scores high on this scale will likely be rated as more effective in interaction by residents than an assistant who scores low on this scale.

2. The CDP (family self) scale of the TSCS is positively correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. The student assistant who scores high on this scale will likely be rated as more effective in interaction by residents than an assistant who scores low on this scale.

3. The DP (defensive positive) scale of the TSCS is positively correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. The student assistant who scores high on this scale will likely be rated as more effective in interaction by residents than an assistant who scores low on this scale.

4. The PD (personality disorder) scale of the TSCS is positively

correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. The student assistant who scores high on this scale will likely be rated as more effective in interaction by residents than an assistant who scores low on this scale.

5. Employment experience as a student assistant was found to be correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. The student assistant employed for a greater length of time will likely be rated as more effective in interaction than an assistant more recently employed.

6. The sex of a student assistant was found to be correlated ($p<.05$) with student assistant interaction effectiveness as measured by the IS. A female student assistant will likely be rated as more effective in interaction than a male assistant.

7. Differences between the male and female student assistant groups were found to be significant ($p<.05$) on four of the thirty-six variables tested. These four variables were: interaction effectiveness (IS), CAP-physical self (TSCS), CDP-family self (TSCS), and PD-personality disorder (TSCS).

8. Prediction of male student assistant interaction effectiveness at a significant ($p<.05$) level was found to be possible through a regression equation. The best predictor variables were: R3P-behavior self concept (TSCS), NDS-number of deviant signs (TSCS), RTV-variability of self esteem for basic identity, self satisfaction, and behavior (TSCS), college hours completed, age, D1-very definite responses about self (TSCS), TV-total variability of feelings about self (TSCS), D3-undifferentiated manner of responding about self (TSCS), grade point average, and R1P-basic identity (TSCS).

9. Prediction of female student assistant interaction effectiveness at a significant ($p<.05$) level was found to be possible through a regression equation. The best predictor variables were: age, R1P-basic identity (TSCS), PI-personality integration (TSCS), D4-responses about self not very certain (TSCS), GM-general maladjustment (TSCS), N-neurosis (TSCS), grade point average, DP-defensive positive responses (TSCS), dogmatism, and NDS-number of deviant signs (TSCS).

Weaknesses of the Study

Only seventy percent of the student assistants identified as eligible for this study chose to participate. The question quickly arises, did a self-selection process take place which may have served to truncate the scores gathered for this study? As just one example, is it possible that the more dogmatic student assistant may be threatened by such assessment as the TSCS and the DS? The absence of data on these nonparticipating student assistants would have to be regarded as one of the major weaknesses of this study.

An additional weakness, not uncommon to this type of study, is the absence of a cross-validation of the findings. The possibility of chance error entering into the determination of regression weights must be considered. Regression weights are optimum only on the particular sample included in the study (Anastasi, 1968, p. 147). A cross-validation could be accomplished by obtaining criterion scores on a new sample, then correlating these new scores with the predicted criterion scores derived from the regression equation.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study, several suggestions may be offered. The office of single student housing at the university studied should administer the TSCS to all new student assistant applicants. The predicted interaction effectiveness score should be computed and used in conjunction with application forms and personal interviews in the employment of new student assistants.

Accurate records of student assistant characteristics should be maintained by the single student housing office. A periodic assessment of interaction effectiveness of all student assistants should be conducted. A study of data from these records should be undertaken to determine if, in fact, the use of the regression equation prediction results in increased interaction effectiveness of student assistants employed under this procedure.

Further investigation into the relationship between length of student assistant experience and interaction effectiveness seems appropriate. If factors could be identified which predict those student assistants likely to terminate or be terminated at an early stage, this information would be valuable. On the other hand, if other factors are equal and effective student assistants are lost through early termination, the need for improved job retention efforts by the housing office seem great.

Replication of this investigation at this university studied is recommended. A replication would serve as a cross-validation of the present findings. A replication at another institution might indicate the applicability of the findings in different settings.

Investigators should continue to research and develop additional measures of those characteristics which are possessed by effective helpers. Through improved methods of predicting successful performance, student personnel workers may be selected for employment in residence halls who will be more able to facilitate the development of the "whole" student.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, A. Differential psychology, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1958.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Anthony, V. L. "Personality correlates of effectiveness among student assistants in residence halls." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

Bentine, E. Human relationships -- in the family, in friendship, in love. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

Biggs, D. A. "Selecting residence counselors -- job viewpoints and interpersonal attitudes." The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 111-115.

Blocher, D. H. Developmental counseling. New York: Ronald Press, 1966.

Bolton, B. Readings in rehabilitation research: an introduction to methodology. (ARR&TC No. 697), Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1972.

Brown, W. F. and Zunker, V. G. "Student counselor utilization at four-year institutions of higher learning." The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 41-46.

Brown, W. F. "Effectiveness of paraprofessionals: the evidence." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 53, 257-263.

Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. Higher education in transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Bruning, J. L. and Kintz, B. L. Computional handbook of statistics. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.

Caracena, P. F. and Vicory, J. R. "Correlates of phenomenological and judged empathy." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 510-515.

Carkhuff, R. R. and Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Chickering, A. W. "College residences and student development." Educational Record, 1967, 48, 179-186.

Cochran, W. G., and Cox, G. M. Experimental designs. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.

Conger, A. J., and Jackson, D. N. "Suppressor variables, prediction, and the interpretation of psychological relationships." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1972, 32, 579-599.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing, 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Dixon, W. J. BMD - biomedical computer programs. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

English, H. B. and English, A. C. A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms. New York: David McKay, 1958.

Fitts, W. H. Manual for the Tennessee self concept scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Fitts, W. H. et al. The self concept and self-actualization. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1971.

Fitts, W. H. The self concept and psychopathology. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1972a.

Fitts, W. H. The self concept and performance. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1972b.

Fitts, W. H. The self concept and behavior: overview and supplement. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1972c.

Greenleaf, E. A. "Residence halls 1970's." NASPA Journal, 1969, 7, 65-71.

Guilford, J. P. and Fruchter, B. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education, 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Hall, C. S. and Lindzey, G. Theories of personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.

Hansen, J. C., Moore, G. D., and Carkhuff, R. R. "The differential relationships of objective and client perceptions of counseling." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 244-246.

Holbrook, R. L. "Student volunteers as helpers in residence halls." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 559-561.

Hoyt, D. P. and Davidson, A. "Evaluating residence hall advisors." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 251-256.

Janzen, F. V. "Client-counselor perceptual congruency as measured by the interaction scale." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1970.)

Jensen, B. T., Coles, G. and Nestor, B. "The criterion problem in guidance research." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 58-61.

Jorgensen, G. Q. et al. Interpersonal relationships: factors in job placement. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1968.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Lake, D. G., Miles, Matthew B., and Earle, Ralph B. Jr., eds. Measuring human behavior. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.

Marion, P. B. "Dogmatism and resident advisor success." The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 1973, 3, 43-45.

Miley, C. H. "Birth order research 1963-1967: bibliography and index." Journal of Individual Psychology, 1969, 25, 64-70.

Miller, L. A. "As compared to what?" in Kenneth W. Reagles (ed.), Symposium on the criterion problem in the evaluation of counselor performance. (ARR&TC No. 715), Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1972.

Mueller, K. H. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Murphy, R. O. "Administrative practices in utilizing students as staff in residence halls." The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1964, 6, 109-113.

Murphy, R. O. and Ortenzi, A. "Use of standardized measurements in the selection of residence hall staff." The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 360-363.

McWhirter, J. J. "Two measures of the facilitative conditions." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 317-320.

Oberlander, M. I. et al. "The relationship of ordinal position and sex to interest patterns." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1971, 119, 29-36.

Pietrofesa, J. J., Leonard, G. E., and Van Hoose, W. The authentic counselor. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971.

Powell, J. W., Plyler, S. A., Dickson, B. A., and McClellan, S. D. The personnel assistant in residence halls. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Rokeach, M. "The nature and meaning of dogmatism." Psychological Review, 1954, 61, 194-204.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Runyon, R. P., and Haber, A. Fundamentals of behavioral statistics. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

Schachter, S. The psychology of affiliation. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Schroeder, K., Hill, C. E., Gormally, J., and Anthony, W. A. "Systematic human relations training for resident assistants." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 313-316.

Schroeder, P. and Dowse, E. "Selection, function, and assessment of residence hall counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 151-156.

Shapiro, J. G., Foster, C. P., and Powell, T. "Facial and bodily cues of genuineness, empathy and warmth." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 233-236.

Shertzer, B. and Stone, S. C. Fundamentals of counseling, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Steenland, R. "Paraprofessionals in counseling centers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 51, 417-418.

Thompson, W. Correlates of the self concept. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1972.

Triandis, H. C. Attitude and attitude change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Truax, C. B. "Therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and patient personality change in group psychotherapy: A comparison between interaction unit measures, time sample measures, patient perception measures." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 225-229.

Williams, D. E. and Reillery, R. T. "The impact of residence halls on students." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 402-410.

Wrenn, C. G. Student personnel work in college. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Wylie, R. C. The self concept: a critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Wylie, R. C. The self-concept, revised ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Wyrick, R. J. and Mitchell, K. M. "Relationship between resident assistants' empathy and warmth and their effectiveness." Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 36-40.

Zunker, V. G. and Brown, W. F. "Comparative effectiveness of student and professional counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 738-743.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTION AND SELECTION CRITERIA, DIVISION OF SINGLE STUDENT HOUSING

STUDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTION
AND SELECTION CRITERIA,
DIVISION OF SINGLE STUDENT HOUSING

JOB TITLE: Student Assistant

JOB DESCRIPTION: Assist the Head Resident with the management of a wing or floor within the residence hall and accept responsibility for the following specific duties as assigned by the Head Resident.

SELECTION: A Student Assistant is an undergraduate, available in the residence hall to be of assistance to students. The Student Assistant is selected on the basis of a display of sensitivity to and interest in people; objectivity and respect for the worth and dignity of the individual; open mindedness on issues; empathy; and the ability to handle autonomy and make decisions.

SPECIFIC DUTIES:

A. Assist students in meeting their academic responsibilities.

1. Challenge students to academic excellence and intellectual curiosity in every way possible.
2. Be aware of academic achievement through everyday contact with students, knowing who may have academic difficulty and referring them for assistance.
3. Help students, especially freshmen, to develop effective study habits.
4. Encourage discussion groups, seminars or other programs on the floor/wing which will broaden students' educational experiences.
5. Be available as much as possible in own room during the evenings in order to be of maximum help to students.
6. Work with students and floor/wing officers to bring about a self responsibility for quiet hours.
7. Take appropriate action when necessary for maintaining an atmosphere conducive to study.

B. Know and assist individual students in developing personally and socially.

1. Build rapport and become acquainted with each student on the floor/wing.
   a. Eat with students in the cafeteria.

b. Attend campus cultural programs and encourage students to go along.
c. Attend activities of the hall and complex.
d. Attend every House Council meeting.
e. Participate in and encourage significant educational discussion groups on the floor/wing.
f. Be available at regular times for assistance to students.

2. Learn to know strengths and weaknesses of those living on the floor/wing.

a. Observe any student with special health problems.
b. Observe general relationships among members of groups.
c. Know students who are willing to accept responsibilities.

3. Provide accurate information.

a. Know and be able to explain the rationale supporting University and Residence Hall policies and regulations.
b. Know campus agencies to which students may be referred.
c. Be available to answer general questions.

C. Administrative responsibilities

1. Prepare, maintain and utilize various records as requested by the Head Resident.

2. General operations:

a. Assume "on duty" responsibilities in hall.
b. Attend weekly staff meetings.
c. Compile floor/wing grade average.
d. Attend in-service training programs.
e. Opening and closing of hall.
f. Room requests.

D. Actively promote the establishment of a relationship between the living situation and the on-going cultural, academic and social life of the University.

1. Promote programs and planning which articulate the residence halls with the traditional programs of the University.
2. Promote programs which engage and enlarge the student's aesthetic interests and understanding.
3. Promote programs which raise the student's social awareness and sense of responsibility.
4. Work with hall government and appropriate University agencies to provide adequate social and recreational opportunities for all students who live on the floor/wing.

E. Advise student groups.

Each residence hall has basic governmental functions and each Student Assistant is responsible for advising floor/wing government. Effective advising implies at least the following:

1. Know the organization and activities of the Hall Council, Complex government, and RHA.
2. Communicate weekly with floor/wing officers.
3. Attend all meetings and functions of group.
4. Serve as resource person step in to avoid "disaster" when hall and students are greatly affected.
5. Help groups to examine and to evaluate their programs. Guide but do not dominate.
6. Encourage development of leadership and programs.
7. Encourage capable students to contribute to the Residence Hall program by participating in student government.

F. Assist in maintaining an atmosphere that is conducive to self-discipline.

1. Set the best possible example by own action.
2. Assist in development of maturity in each student.
3. Help develop an educational program so residents know and understand rules and regulations.
4. Encourage floor/wing officers to help enforce rules and regulations.

G. Prepare self with information and skills necessary for job.

1. Pre-school workshop.
2. In-service training.
3. Individual conferences with supervisor for purposes of self-growth and evaluation.

H. Interpret administration to students and students to administration.

1. Work with floor/wing government to develop effective communication to achieve this end.
2. Work through floor/wing government to develop a knowledge and appreciation of administrative process among floor/wing leaders.

I. The Student Assistant Council

The Council is composed of one Student Assistant from each hall, elected by the staff within each hall at its first meeting, and this group meets with the Associate Director of Single Student Housing in an attempt to up-grade and improve our Student Assistant program.

It is believed that this input is necessary if programs are to be effective and it is further expected that each member will serve as a representative of his or her staff to the Council.

APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

SCORE DESCRIPTIONS

TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
SCORE DESCRIPTIONS

T/F: the ratio of true to false responses - a measure of response set in self-description. High scores indicate acquiescence, poor impulse control and a tendency to be influenced easily by others.

SC: self criticism - openness or willingness to reveal negative features, as opposed to defensiveness or an effort to distort the self-description favorably. High scores generally indicate a normal, healthy openness and capacity for self criticism.

NC: net conflict - contradiction between responses to positive and negative items in the same content area. It is a directional measure on which high scores indicate stronger affirmation of positive attributes than denial of equivalent negative attributes; low or negative scores indicate consistent over-denial of negative items.

TC: total conflict - contradiction, confusion, or dissonance. High scores indicate conflict or inconsistency between responses to positive and negative items in the same content area without regard to the direction of the conflict.

TP: total positive - reflects the overall level of self esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel they are persons of value and worth, have confidence in themselves, and act accordingly.

(R1P, R2P, R3P - self esteem from an internal frame of reference)

R1P: basic identity - self-descriptions in terms of who and what. High scores reflect high self-esteem of identity; low scores indicate low self-esteem.

R2P: self satisfaction - feelings about the self; self-acceptance.

R3P: behavior - self-judgements concerned with functioning and activities.

(CAP, CBP, CCP, CDP, DEP - self esteem from an external frame of reference)

CAP: physical self - physical attributes and functioning including state of physical health and sexuality.

CBP: moral-ethical self - self from a moral, religious and ethical standpoint.

CCP: personal self - sense of personal worth and adequacy.

CDP: family self - self in relation to the primary group of family and close friends. Perception of how much the self is liked, respected, and valued by others.

CEP: social self - general adequacy and desirability in relation to all others.

TV: total variability - high scores mean that the person's self concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or integration.

CTV: column total variability - variability of self esteem for physical, moral-ethical, personal, family, and social self.

RTV: row total variability - variability of self esteem for basic identity, self satisfaction, and behavior.

DD: distribution score - a summary of D1 through D5 counts, a measure of certainty of self-perception apart from the positive or negative direction of the responses. High scores indicate that the subject is very definite and certain in what he says about himself while low scores mean just the opposite.

D5: the number of "completely true" responses - very definite.

D4: the number of "mostly true" responses - not very certain.

D3: the number of "partly true-partly false" responses - completely undifferentiated.

D2: the number of "mostly false" responses - not very certain.

D1: the number of "completely false" responses - very definite.

DP: defensive positive - subtle defensive distortion in self-description derived from those items which differentiate psychiatric patients who have high P Scores from those who do not. A high DP Score indicates a positive self-description stemming from defensive distortion. Well-integrated people usually score near, or slightly above the mean. A significantly low DP score means that the person is lacking in the usual defenses for maintaining even minimal self esteem.

GM: general maladjustment - a general index of adjustment-maladjustment. This scale measures the kind of personal maladjustment characteristic of psychiatric patients. It reflects degree but not type of pathology. <u>High scores mean low maladjustment and vice versa</u>.

PSY: psychosis - based on items which differentiate patients with diagnoses of psychosis from all other groups. High scores indicate that the self concept is similar to the self concepts of people who are psychotic, not as conclusive evidence that he is psychotic.

PD: personality disorder - similarity in self-perception to persons diagnosed as having one of the several types of personality disorder. High scores mean low degree of disorder and vice versa.

N: neurosis - similarity of self-perception to people with neuroses. High scores mean low degree of neurosis and vice versa.

PI: personality integration - similarity in self-perception to people who are considered to be above average in mental health or personality integration.

NDS: number of deviant signs - summarizes the deviant features in the self concept (scores exceeding the normal limits and deviant fluctuations in the profile) across all the scores. It is the best single index of psychopathology. High scores indicate deviant self concepts; well integrated people have low NDS Scores.

APPENDIX C

DOGMATISM SCALE

FORM E

DOGMATISM SCALE - FORM E

Code No. _____

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

CODE:

+1: I Agree A Little	-1: I Disagree A Little
+2: I Agree On The Whole	-2: I Disagree On The Whole
+3: I Agree Very Much	-3: I Disagree Very Much

Respond to each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it.

EXAMPLE:

(+3) +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 (1) All youth should be educated.

In this example the respondent agreed very much with this statement.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION. CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of a democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I just can't stop.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX D

INTERACTION SCALE

Code No. _____

INTERACTION SCALE

How do you feel about the student assistant on your floor or wing? To answer this question and others concerned with your relationship, please circle (a), (b), (c), or (d) to the right of each of the statements below.*

Circle (a) if you feel this way most of the time.
Circle (b) if you feel this way more than half of the time.
Circle (c) if you feel this way less than half of the time.
Circle (d) if you hardly ever feel this way.

Remember that your answers apply to your general feeling about your student assistant.

		Most of the Time	More than Half of the Time	Less than Half of the Time	Hardly ever
1.	I like him	(a)	b	c	d
2.	I misunderstand him	a	b	c	(d)
3.	I calm him	(a)	b	c	d
4.	I upset him	a	b	c	(d)
5.	I mislead him	a	b	c	(d)
6.	I accept him	(a)	b	c	d
7.	I support him	(a)	b	c	d
8.	I oppose him	a	b	c	(d)
9.	I understand him	(a)	b	c	d
10.	I distrust him	a	b	c	(d)
11.	I trust him	(a)	b	c	d
12.	I reject him	a	b	c	(d)
13.	I protect him	(a)	b	c	d
14.	I attack him	a	b	c	(d)
15.	I help him	(a)	b	c	d
16.	I dislike him	a	b	c	(d)
17.	I guide him	(a)	b	c	d
18.	I displease him	a	b	c	(d)
19.	I hinder him	a	b	c	(d)
20.	I please him	(a)	b	c	d

***Circled response on this key represents maximum score**

How do you think the student assistant on your floor or wing feels about you? Answer this question by circling (a), (b), (c), or (d) for each of the statements below.

Circle (a) if you think your SA feels this way about you most of the time.
Circle (b) if you think your SA feels this way about you more than half of the time.
Circle (c) if you think your SA feels this way about you less than half of the time.
Circle (d) if you think your SA hardly ever feels this way about you.

Remember that your answers apply to your general impression of your student assistant's feelings about you.

		Most of the Time	More than Half of the Time	Less than Half of the Time	Hardly ever
1.	He likes me	(a)	b	c	d
2.	He misunderstands me	a	b	c	(d)
3.	He calms me	(a)	b	c	d
4.	He upsets me	a	b	c	(d)
5.	He misleads me	a	b	c	(d)
6.	He accepts me	(a)	b	c	d
7.	He supports me	(a)	b	c	d
8.	He opposes me	a	b	c	(d)
9.	He understands me	(a)	b	c	d
10.	He distrusts me	a	b	c	(d)
11.	He trusts me	(a)	b	c	d
12.	He rejects me	a	b	c	(d)
13.	He protects me	(a)	b	c	d
14.	He attacks me	a	b	c	(d)
15.	He helps me	(a)	b	c	d
16.	He dislikes me	a	b	c	(d)
17.	He guides me	(a)	b	c	d
18.	He displeases me	a	b	c	(d)
19.	He hinders me	a	b	c	(d)
20.	He pleases me	(a)	b	c	d

APPENDIX E

SELF REPORT FORM

_____
Code No.

SELF REPORT FORM

All information used in this study will be treated confidentially. Please complete the following:

1. Date of birth_____/ ____/ _____ 2. College major?_____
mo. day year

3. Number of college hrs. completed at end of this sem._____

4. Overall grade point average of all work attempted_____

5. Number of months of experience as a residence hall assistant (at OSU)____

(at other institutions)_____

6. Are you an only child_____, first-born_____, twin_____

7. If you are first-born or later born in your family, please list the age and sex of your brothers and sisters from the eldest to the youngest (include your own age, circle it to indicate it as yours).

AGE	SEX
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. Check which of the following statements are true to <u>any</u> degree of your decision to want to become a resident asst.

_____ A) to gain experience in dealing with people
_____ B) to earn part of educational expenses
_____ C) to explore a career in student housing administration
_____ D) to counsel with people
_____ E) to gain work experience
_____ F) to gain confidence in yourself
_____ G) to gain leadership experience
_____ H) to earn pocket money
_____ I) to explore a career as a professional counselor
_____ J) other (specify) _____

Now, please rank those you checked in order from 1 to ...
(mark the rank just to the left of the column)

9. If any of these items 1-8 need clarification, do so on the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER TO STUDENT ASSISTANTS

April 22, 1974

Dear Residence Hall Student Assistant:

With full approval of the Division of Single Student Housing, my doctoral research involves a study of the position of student assistant at O.S.U.

Your participation in this study will result in findings which may result in more efficient and valid procedures for selection of future SA's. I want to assure you that your responses will be held in confidence. A coding system has been devised and all data will be handled anonymously.

The materials you are to complete will require approximately 25 to 40 minutes of your time. When you have finished, place all three items in the envelope provided. Any campus mail drop may be used and no postage is required. Please make your return as promptly as possible.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

W. Harold Skinner
Doctoral Student
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX G

COVER LETTER TO RESIDENTS

April 23, 1974

Dear Residence Hall Student:

With full approval of the Division of Single Student Housing, my doctoral research involves student assistants (floor counselors) at O.S.U.

You have been randomly selected to complete an evaluation form on your student assistant. This should take about 5 minutes or less of your time. Only a few persons per floor were selected, so your prompt response is important to the success of my research.

After taking a few minutes to complete the form, place it in the envelope provided. Any campus mail drop may be used for return with no postage required.

Your evaluation will be held confidential with complete anonymity assured. Do not put your name or that of your student assistant on the form. The code number will allow for a follow-up of any forms not returned within three days.

I appreciate your cooperation in this study of student assistants. Thanks!

Sincerely,

W. Harold Skinner
Doctoral Student
Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX H

OUTLINE OF TESTING INSTRUCTIONS

TO HEAD RESIDENTS

OUTLINE OF TESTING INSTRUCTIONS
TO HEAD RESIDENTS

1. Thank you for assisting in this study.

2. Here is a packet for each student assistant in your dormitory.

3. Each packet contains a letter briefly explaining the study, a demographic self report form, an opinion questionnaire, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, and a preaddressed envelope for return of the materials. The instructions on each of the instruments are self explanatory.

4. By agreement with the Division of Single Student Housing, these instruments are to be administered at your next regularly scheduled staff meeting.

5. The completion of these instruments should require from twenty to forty-five minutes, with most finishing in twenty-five to thirty minutes.

APPENDIX I

INTERCORRELATION MATRICES

Appendix I includes Tables XII, XIII, and XIV. The intercorrelations among variables included in this study may be seen in these tables. Data for all student assistants in the study may be seen in Table XII. Data for the male student assistant group may be seen in Table XIII and data for the female group may be seen in Table XIV.

TABLE XII

INTERRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL STUDENT ASSISTANTS
N=70

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
1.	IS		17	24	06	31	-07	-14	-03	-18	-03	-13	25	20	23	22	-01	22	20	32	24	-11	-10	-08	17	12	-11	-15	-11	19	25	23	-11	29	11	07	-04	29
2.	GPA			28	28	36	-05	-21	-27	17	-25	-21	26	15	26	27	20	25	32	19	10	-24	-25	-13	06	-01	01	-12	06	07	04	24	-18	20	15	21	-18	02
3.	CHC				75	54	04	-10	-02	05	-07	22	-19	-19	-16	-15	-03	-06	-18	-20	-27	01	00	03	-13	-09	21	-01	21	-16	-20	-08	08	-21	-25	06	-01	-03
4.	AGE					47	-04	-03	11	10	11	12	-14	-17	-14	-06	00	-01	-10	-19	-19	05	02	07	-09	-09	19	-03	16	-18	-13	-07	19	-19	-15	-03	09	-16
5.	MOX						-03	-10	-11	11	-14	12	-02	-11	00	04	-07	03	03	00	-07	-15	14	-10	-09	-11	07	05	12	-08	-09	03	-07	-06	-10	08	-07	07
6.	B/O							-03	03	04	06	01	-14	-09	-14	-13	-05	-04	-18	-24	-04	14	14	08	-07	01	-09	14	02	-08	-13	-12	02	-09	-20	00	00	-01
7.	DS								25	-17	45	11	-28	-19	-30	-23	-07	-33	-21	-23	-28	10	19	-06	-21	01	-08	28	13	-31	-01	-29	23	-29	-21	-18	25	-19
8.	T/F									07	86	13	-06	02	-04	-14	04	-18	-12	05	-05	12	11	08	04	03	19	18	01	-37	-10	20	-16	33	-24	04	-21	31	01
9.	SC										-03	20	-12	-17	-02	-15	-01	07	-12	-17	-15	-11	-06	-14	07	03	06	19	-08	-05	-10	-52	-16	35	-31	-21	14	-08	-08
10.	NC											02	01	01	02	-01	12	-09	-05	06	-02	07	06	05	13	38	-08	-05	-23	-12	31	-14	11	-11	11	-29	37	-11
11.	TC												-42	-37	-35	-39	-24	-28	-41	-37	-34	31	23	32	-11	-03	-01	22	-14	-05	-38	-38	11	-37	-37	-37	40	-13
12.	TP													85	89	91	63	82	91	81	81	-35	-34	-22	83	70	-51	-74	-54	80	80	91	-23	85	89	-07	-26	04
13.	R1P														59	75	48	63	75	78	75	-04	07	-18	75	60	-41	-65	-57	76	68	87	-33	72	81	-14	-35	09
14.	R2P															69	61	77	82	69	65	-48	-27	-17	69	60	-42	-62	-45	65	72	71	-14	76	74	04	-15	03
15.	R3P																57	76	83	70	77	-31	-27	-24	78	67	-52	-71	-44	74	73	88	-18	78	83	-12	-23	-02
16.	CAP																	45	51	29	29	-36	-32	-27	56	48	-23	-58	-30	46	49	54	-09	28	66	03	-22	-26
17.	CBP																		73	55	56	-28	-33	-11	72	60	-48	-65	-42	71	62	69	-16	88	63	-09	-13	13
18.	CCP																			69	70	-41	-37	-31	68	54	-38	-64	-41	67	74	87	-13	79	82	02	-28	03
19.	CDP																				66	-29	-28	-20	59	52	-39	-49	-45	59	69	74	-25	74	73	-01	-25	23
20.	CEP																					-05	-07	-01	76	66	-54	-60	-57	77	66	79	-29	71	70	-22	-15	00
21.	TV																						89	78	03	06	-07	08	-22	10	-19	-25	03	-25	-28	-38	25	07
22.	CTV																							40	-06	-04	02	13	-14	02	-20	-18	00	-27	-22	-33	04	00
23.	RTV																								14	18	-17	-02	-23	17	-11	-26	06	-12	-24	-31	44	15
24.	DD																									92	-65	-85	-69	92	66	75	-29	68	74	-37	03	-05
25.	D5																										-80	-64	-72	79	62	59	-20	57	62	-56	23	-10
26.	D4																											23	55	-67	-49	-45	12	-55	-39	66	-30	07
27.	D3																												32	-68	-52	-67	33	-56	-70	-04	20	06
28.	D2																													-80	-49	-49	10	-41	-46	63	-24	-06
29.	D1																														63	77	-27	71	69	-44	02	04
30.	DP																															68	21	73	78	-22	01	01
31.	GM																																-24	74	81	-06	-41	04
32.	PSY																																	-19	-10	-11	29	-15
33.	FD																																		68	-14	-13	21
34.	N																																			-07	-26	-13
35.	PI																																				-59	15
36.	NDS																																					09
37.	SEX																																					

TABLE XIII

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR MALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS
N=27

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
1.	IS		19	25	-07	32	-17	-10	12	-22	24	02	23	11	21	28	21	17	23	20	19	-18	-10	-23	25	22	-12	-27	-11	18	30	20	-05	26	22	00	20
2.	GPA			28	39	31	21	-34	-31	18	-18	-34	34	35	24	36	47	23	36	21	25	-07	-08	-03	21	14	-06	-27	-03	18	23	37	-30	30	24	20	-17
3.	CHC				60	55	22	-25	04	-08	-07	-15	10	09	10	09	17	15	08	07	-02	-24	-17	-25	04	-11	29	-26	20	-02	02	17	04	01	04	31	-28
4.	AGE					43	20	-18	12	08	18	-41	28	28	18	34	35	29	27	11	24	-08	-06	-09	25	17	07	-45	10	09	15	33	02	16	26	18	-24
5.	MOX						01	-28	00	06	-02	-12	31	24	31	28	36	28	29	25	19	-22	-22	-09	21	11	07	-33	17	17	24	29	-10	20	25	29	-26
6.	B/O							-25	-12	19	-18	-17	01	-08	06	01	06	15	-12	-10	04	-06	-18	13	-08	-09	08	04	11	-08	-14	-01	-02	03	-19	33	-15
7.	DS								39	09	57	01	-32	-32	-23	-35	-18	-31	-30	-18	-42	-11	-11	-08	-29	-05	-01	37	17	-40	-24	-45	-03	-34	-30	-09	27
8.	T/F									19	76	27	-18	-11	-20	-17	-07	-27	-28	-02	-16	09	07	10	01	15	06	03	-19	-11	-16	-25	14	-32	-07	-20	32
9.	SC										08	12	-14	-09	-12	-16	13	-17	-22	-15	-13	09	00	19	-03	14	-12	22	-29	-04	-45	-11	-49	-26	-29	-16	05
10.	NC											04	-06	-11	-06	01	08	-12	-11	05	-13	02	-02	07	14	39	-26	-05	-08	-10	05	-17	05	-10	04	-30	44
11.	TC												-34	-34	-26	-34	-23	-33	-31	-30	-28	45	33	48	-07	03	-13	31	-36	06	-32	-27	35	-36	-20	-47	43
12.	TP													86	91	93	79	91	93	86	83	-45	-47	-26	87	73	-57	-83	-55	84	91	94	-42	94	91	-09	-13
13.	R1P														63	80	69	76	81	79	64	-26	-15	-33	74	57	-36	-76	-45	72	72	87	-56	79	87	01	-29
14.	R2P															75	68	85	83	79	76	-58	-68	-24	75	67	-60	-65	-52	74	87	77	-30	87	74	-10	00
15.	R3P																77	85	88	73	82	-29	-32	-15	88	74	-54	-87	-51	82	85	93	-35	86	89	-12	-12
16.	CAP																	63	75	59	53	-24	-29	-08	72	65	-47	-68	-45	64	64	77	-40	62	72	01	-19
17.	CBP																		85	72	71	-43	-44	-26	81	66	-53	-77	-49	79	80	87	-34	92	76	-05	-13
18.	CCP																			70	72	-40	-41	-25	79	62	-46	-81	-42	76	86	94	-28	87	88	00	-17
19.	CDP																				61	-59	-54	-47	67	59	-49	-59	-46	64	81	71	-47	84	82	-10	-13
20.	CEP																					-21	-32	03	80	65	-52	-74	-55	81	79	76	-33	75	73	-21	06
21.	TV																						91	79	-11	-07	04	17	-09	-06	-40	-28	25	-46	-29	-32	23
22.	CTV																							46	-22	-23	23	19	08	-18	-44	-30	16	-44	-27	-17	04
23.	RTV																								10	18	-24	08	-31	15	-21	-16	30	-32	-23	-43	43
24.	DD																									92	-73	-87	-74	95	80	86	-35	78	83	-41	18
25.	D5																										-90	-66	-78	83	66	66	-38	66	68	-60	42
26.	D4																											35	74	-72	-53	-46	33	-58	-48	73	-57
27.	D3																												38	-76	-78	-89	25	-72	-85	00	17
28.	D2																													-84	-42	-50	31	-47	-45	70	-45
29.	D1																														75	84	-32	78	77	-46	19
30.	DP																															80	-20	90	88	-10	-01
31.	GM																																-36	85	90	-03	-25
32.	PSY																																	-37	-29	05	16
33.	FD																																		84	-10	-08
34.	N																																			-10	-16
35.	PI																																				-79
36.	NDS																																				

TABLE XIV

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR FEMALE STUDENT ASSISTANTS

N=43

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
1.	IS		21	23	24	29	-04	-10	-12	-11	-12	-13	17	21	12	14	-02	12	13	22	21	-02	-02	00	11	07	-15	-04	-07	16	17	20	-06	15	06	04	-18
2.	GPA			23	16	37	-31	-11	-23	18	-24	-05	06	-07	10	10	05	12	19	03	-11	-21	-22	-12	-13	-18	09	08	14	-09	-18	06	-05	00	03	19	-11
3.	CHC				89	54	-05	05	-07	12	-09	44	06	-39	-32	-35	-38	-19	-39	-37	-41	13	06	18	-28	-25	14	23	33	-27	-33	-27	09	-35	-46	-10	21
4.	AGE					53	-17	03	10	09	04	38	-44	-45	-34	-38	-26	-27	-39	-32	-45	10	02	17	-40	-35	30	33	19	-38	-29	25	-38	-47	-10	30
5.	MOX						-05	05	-16	14	-19	27	-29	-37	-25	-16	-27	-19	-18	-22	-24	-12	-11	-09	-29	-29	07	35	24	-29	-30	-17	-04	-28	-33	-05	08
6.	B/O							16	08	-07	14	06	-17	-05	-18	-19	-10	-11	-17	-25	-02	15	22	-01	-04	11	-22	19	-05	-05	-05	-15	01	-11	-16	-17	07
7.	DS								19	-38	36	13	-18	-02	-30	-10	-09	-26	-09	-15	-12	24	36	-02	-13	04	-12	21	08	-19	21	-12	37	-13	-16	-19	18
8.	T/F									02	90	09	-01	07	04	-15	09	-16	-04	06	-02	14	15	08	05	23	26	00	-47	-10	36	-14	43	-22	-09	09	33
9.	SC										-08	25	-13	-24	02	-17	02	-10	-04	-16	-12	-09	-17	05	05	-01	40	-32	10	-15	-57	-20	-61	-35	-21	-30	16
10.	NC											01	02	08	03	-07	10	-10	-03	06	00	14	14	10	10	37	05	-02	-33	-15	43	-15	49	-12	11	-28	34
11.	TC												-53	-41	-49	-49	-32	58	58	46	44	31	23	31	-18	-11	09	20	01	-17	-46	-50	-02	-41	-54	-30	39
12.	TP													85	88	89	58	43	70	82	83	-37	-34	-28	78	66	-44	-65	-51	75	73	88	-11	80	90	-03	-45
13.	R1P														57	73	43	51	81	77	85	02	13	-15	78	67	-47	-57	-65	81	67	87	-17	68	80	-24	-43
14.	R2P															63	58	74	78	67	60	-52	-58	-24	61	49	-23	-59	-35	54	62	65	-06	69	76	17	-38
15.	R3P																48	67	41	72	75	-38	-30	-36	67	59	-51	-52	-38	66	64	84	-08	75	79	-11	-38
16.	CAP																	40	60	21	17	-39	-34	-31	49	37	-06	-55	-26	39	43	45	00	18	62	10	-31
17.	CBP																		41	42	50	-31	-37	-12	63	53	-43	-53	-33	61	51	52	-03	84	57	-12	-18
18.	CCP																			72	79	-47	-39	-41	57	45	-31	-47	-39	58	65	81	-02	73	79	05	-44
19.	CDP																				79	-23	-21	-16	56	49	-33	-45	-41	55	63	80	-07	64	76	04	-41
20.	CEP																					-07	-02	-11	72	67	-55	-49	-57	74	60	83	-29	75	70	-20	-39
21.	TV																						90	78	10	16	-14	06	-27	14	-14	-29	-03	-23	-31	-45	33
22.	CTV																							43	03	09	-11	14	-27	12	-12	-15	-04	-25	-25	-43	12
23.	RTV																								16	20	-14	-08	-17	13	-11	-38	-01	-11	-27	-31	52
24.	DD																									91	-56	-83	-66	90	55	65	-29	62	67	-34	-17
25.	D5																										-71	-62	-69	76	60	52	-10	54	56	-52	-01
26.	D4																											11	40	-63	-46	-46	-01	-56	-31	60	-02
27.	D3																												28	-61	-31	-47	44	-44	-58	-11	27
28.	D2																													-76	-54	-47	-05	-34	-48	61	-05
29.	D1																														54	72	-25	66	64	-43	-18
30.	DP																															60	44	63	73	-27	-01
31.	GM																																-17	66	76	-07	-59
32.	PSY																																	-03	-03	-17	39
33.	FD																																		64	-19	-20
34.	N																																			00	-40
35.	PI																																				45
36.	NDS																																				

VITA

Wesley Harold Skinner

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: SELECTED CORRELATES OF INTERACTION EFFECTIVENESS AMONG RESIDENCE HALL ASSISTANTS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Cleveland County, Oklahoma, October 15, 1939, the son of Oliver and Dorothy Skinner.

Education: Attended primary and secondary school at Wanette, Oklahoma; graduated from Wanette High School, Wanette, Oklahoma, in 1957; received the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree from East Central Oklahoma State University, Ada, Oklahoma, with a major in History-Government, in 1961; received the Master of Teaching degree from East Central Oklahoma State University, Ada, Oklahoma, with a major in Guidance and Counseling, in 1963; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: Employed as classroom teacher, Hennessey Public Schools, Hennessey, Oklahoma, 1961-62 and 1962-63; school counselor, Hennessey Public Schools, Hennessey, Oklahoma, 1963-64 and 1964-65; vocational rehabilitation counselor, Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, July, 1965, through October, 1968; instructor, Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, November, 1968, to present.

Professional Organizations: National Vocational Guidance Association; American Personnel and Guidance Association; American School Counselor Association; Association for Counselor Education and Supervision; National Rehabilitation Association; National Rehabilitation Counseling Association; Oklahoma Rehabilitation Association; Oklahoma Rehabilitation Counseling Association; Council of Rehabilitation Counselor Educators; Oklahoma Education Association.